



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

WIDENER



HN T5RF U

C 4356.8



Harvard College Library

FROM

Miss A. F. Rowe

Cambridge

With compliments of
the
Abbot of Mount Melleray

to Miss A. F. Rowe

December, 1912

Pope Adrian IV a Friend of Ireland

POPE ADRIAN IV

A Friend of Ireland

FROM THE

ANALECTA JURIS PONTIFICII

A MAGAZINE ON

THEOLOGY, CANON LAW, LITURGY, AND HISTORY

Translated from the French

BY

THE REV. W. McLOUGHLIN

Mount Melleray Abbey, near Cappoquin, Co. Waterford

DUBLIN

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LIMITED
AND AT BELFAST AND CORK

1906

C 4356.8



*Miss A. F. Peabody,
Cambridge.*

BROWNE AND NOLAN, LTD., PRINTERS, DUBLIN.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

POPE ADRIAN IV. was the only Englishman that ever sat in the Chair of Peter. His original name was Nicholas Breakspeare, and he was born (we may suppose in the early part of the twelfth century) at Langley, near St. Alban's, in Hertfordshire. He was inured to hardships from his youth, for his parents were of lowly condition. The history of his career, from a state of extreme poverty to the highest dignity in the world, that of Supreme Pontiff, is so fully sketched by his Eminence Cardinal Moran in Document No. 1 of the Appendix at the end of this book, that the matter need not be repeated here. As is usual in such cases there are always a few points of difference among historians. For instance, some say that it was in Paris the young Nicholas studied under Marianus, an Irishman.¹ Others say that his mother survived him, and received alms from the Church of Canterbury.² But these are matters which need not detain us at present. What is certain is that Pope Adrian IV. was a staunch defender of ecclesiastical rights, so that he did not hesitate to curb the pride even of a fierce Barbarossa. This is the man who has been so long calumniated as one of the greatest of Ireland's enemies.

Cardinal D'Aragon, who, in the fourteenth century, wrote a Life of the Pontiff, paints his character thus : —
" He was a man of great benignity, mildness, and patience,

¹ *Cambrensis Eversus*, ii., p. 400.

² Rohrbächer, t. xvi., p. 32.

well skilled in the English and Latin tongues, graceful in his conversation, eloquent in his arguments, an eminent leader in sacred song, and a distinguished preacher, slow to anger, quick to pardon, a cheerful giver, bountiful in alms, and in all his ways most admirable."¹

The reader of the following pages will find a most interesting discussion on the merits of the Bull by which Pope Adrian IV. is said to have authorised Henry II., King of England, to invade Ireland. This essay or treatise, written in French by the Rev. Louis Chaillot, first appeared in 1882 in the *Analecta Juris Pontificii*, a large folio magazine devoted to important questions on Theology, Canon Law, Liturgy, and History, and whose central office was in Rome.² A knowledge of it is of great importance to all persons who would wish to be thoroughly acquainted with the sentiments of Pope Adrian IV. in regard to Ireland. And yet how few persons have ever heard of it! The *Analecta* was a work little read, or even known, in these countries, being written chiefly in Latin, with an article occasionally in Italian or French. The author of the essay was an expert in examining difficult points of history. His frequent reference to the writings of Dr. (now Cardinal) Moran, Dr. Lingard, Mr. O'Callaghan, &c., shows that he was familiar even with the English language. It would be a pity that the memory of so valuable a treatise, opening up so many

¹ "Erat enim vir valde benignus, mitis, et patiens, in Anglia et Latina lingua peritus, in sermone facundus, in eloquentia politus, in cantilena præcipuus et prædicator egregius, ad irascendum tardus, ad ignoscendum velox, hilaris dator, in eleemosynis largus, et in omne morum compositione præclarus."—(Muratori, *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores*, iii., i., 441.)

² The *Analecta Juris Pontificii* was succeeded in 1893 by the *Analecta Ecclesiastica*, with a large staff of eminent writers. This new magazine is printed in Rome, and bears the *Imprimatur* of the Master of the Sacred College. The chief manager is the Rev. Felix Cardène.

new views, should be lost, or that English readers should not have an opportunity of weighing its arguments. I have therefore considered it a useful task to translate it into English, so that it may take a permanent form, and be a source of reference for all persons interested in the subject. Its division into chapters is the same here as in the *Analecta*. The notes that I have added are generally intended as side-lights from contemporary history, for the assistance of younger readers.

In my opinion, Irishmen all over the world owe a great debt of gratitude to the Rev. Father Chaillot, who went to so much trouble in investigating a subject that may often have perplexed their minds, and who drew up such a clear statement of a very complex case. His arguments are usually strong ; if any one of them may be considered weak, it ought not to lessen the intrinsic force of the others. A specialist in the study of historical problems, he astonishes by the ingenuity with which he pursues the truth, however obscured or disguised. He is quite familiar with all the chief original sources of information in regard to his subject. The honesty of his motives is apparent on every page.

The learned Benedictine Abbot Dom Francis Gasquet, a man of acknowledged critical acumen, speaking of these matters, says¹: " It was only in the year 1872 that the first indictment of the evidence upon which the ' Bull ' has been accepted as genuine was drawn up by Dr. Moran, and published in the pages of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*. To the arguments against the ' grant ' stated in that article, the editor of the *Analecta Juris Pontificii* has added fresh and almost conclusive evidence of the forgery

¹ *Dublin Review*, July, 1883

of what has been so long left unquestioned and accepted as genuine by historians." Again, this distinguished scholar says that through the labours of the writer in the *Analecta* it is now "possible to show with reason that Adrian IV., so far from giving any encouragement to Henry in his designs on Ireland, in reality refused, when asked, to be a party to the enterprise, and pointed out the injustice of it." He believes it "impossible that the letter of Adrian, addressed to the two Kings (Louis VII. and Henry II.) can have any reference to Spain, while every circumstance in it tending to fix the special country gives weight to the opinion that it was Ireland about which the Pope wrote."

According to the rules of international copyright, a work published in Italy or France may after ten years be translated and published without any restriction in another country, if no authorised translation of it has appeared there during the ten years. More than twenty years have now elapsed since the French Essay was published, and yet no English version of it has appeared.

But as regards books in the English language, and even English articles in magazines, the term of copyright is either forty-two years, or the author's life and seven years, whichever is the longer. Hence, not wishing to encroach upon the legal rights of his Eminence Cardinal Moran, by transferring his Essay bodily from the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* of November, 1872 (see Documents), I asked his permission to use it, and received from him the following kind letter : —

" ST. MARY'S CATHEDRAL,

" SYDNEY, 28th June, 1904.

" MY DEAR FATHER McLoughlin,

" In reply to your letter of the 18th May, I am happy to

give you every permission you desire regarding my paper on Adrian the Fourth's famous Bull.

"You may not be aware that I reprinted that paper with some additions in our *Australian Catholic Record*. I send by post the volume with the two articles embracing that essay.

"As regards the French Essay in the *Analecta*, I fear that it rests on an unsound foundation, perhaps I should say on a false assumption. Still there are some useful remarks in it.

"Professor Thacker, of Chicago, in the United States, has published a volume on the same subject. You will not, I think, agree with his theory, but his criticism of the Bull of Alexander III. is interesting and valuable.

.

"Presenting my kindest remembrance to the Most Rev. Father Abbot, I beg to remain yours faithfully and affectionately,

"✠ PATRICK F. CARDINAL MORAN,
"Archbishop of Sydney."

In the volume of the *Australasian Catholic Record* (1897) which his Eminence was so good as to send me, he gives, it may be said, a new essay, embodying the old one of 1872. This version of his treatise on the subject of Adrian's Bull is so much the more valuable, as it contains all the most important remarks that his Eminence has to add after twenty-five years of reflection. It will be found the first among the Documents at the end of this book.

As the reader will observe, the Cardinal *fears* that the French Essay rests on an unsound foundation. He does not say positively that such is the fact; he modifies his

view so far as to express only a fear. He considers that the initial H. in Pope Adrian's letter to Louis VII. may refer to Hispania (Spain), and not to Hibernia (Ireland). Of course, the greatest possible respect is due to the opinion of such a high authority ; but still no one, I am confident, would be more ready than his Eminence, whose object is truth, to acknowledge that an opinion derives its chief force from the strength of the arguments that can be adduced in its favour. Although the cares of his Eminence in Australia must be very numerous, it is to be hoped that he will yet find leisure to favour the public with his reasons for holding the above opinion. They will be gratefully received ; and we may be sure that, on his side, he will be well pleased if it can be shown by competent critics that any one of them rests on a misapprehension. Granting, however, that such cannot be done, the publication of the present work will not be considered a waste of time, since, in regard to several important points of Irish history, it places the reader in possession of the most reliable views up to date. It may also be useful in suggesting new paths of exploration for future writers. On the main point of all—what is to be thought of the alleged Bull of Adrian IV. to Henry II.—His Eminence is fully convinced, with the author of this essay, that it was nothing but a forgery. The only difference is in the manner of proof.

The title of this book would naturally be "Pope Adrian IV. and Ireland," but for some years past there has been another book before the public with this very name. No one can fail to see what confusion would be caused by having in circulation two books of the same name, though of quite a different character : a purchaser might often find himself in possession of a volume very unlike that which he expected. I have, therefore, presumed to name

this treatise "Pope Adrian IV., a Friend of Ireland," which exactly expresses its tenor from the first to the last page. I cannot help thinking that there is great need of such a book at the present time, if the rising generation are to be directed aright in regard to historical questions.

Strange to say, the author of the book to which I have alluded, maintains that there is no fact in history better established than Adrian's grant of Ireland to Henry. Useless to exclaim: a monstrous imposture! an exploded fiction! He maintains it. Having seen the article in the *Analecta*, he speaks of its theory thus:—"This extraordinary theory has been lately broached and defended by the editor of the *Analecta Juris Pontificii* in a treatise which extends to 125 folio pages, and double-columned. Of course, there can be no objection to have the learned editor maintain his honest opinion on a free question, but there is a strong objection to the grounds of his theory. *For it rests on the assumption and assertion that Ireland was a nation of pagans and apostates.*" How the venerable writer could have passed such a severe censure on the treatise as is expressed in the words that I have just underlined, it is not easy to comprehend; but the reader of the following pages may safely be left to judge for himself whether or not it is deserved. Pope Benedict XIV., in his Constitution to the Index, tells us that a book is not to be judged by some one proposition torn from its context, but the different parts of the book are to be compared, and it may be found that what is obscurely expressed in one place is clearly explained in another. How full of reason is such a remark! An author has even been known to quote a proposition as stated by St. Thomas in his *Summa*, although the Saint stated it only to refute it.

The celebrated preacher and lecturer, Father Thomas

Burke, O.P., having had occasion, in his refutation of Froude, to treat of the Bull attributed to Pope Adrian IV., let us see how he regarded it. "I have studied this question as well as I could," he says, in a discourse at Brooklyn, "and I do not believe that the Pope ever gave the English monarch a commission to invade Ireland." He then goes on to argue that there was no man in Ireland that Henry II. feared more than St. Laurence O'Toole, who, as a lover of his country, was an implacable enemy of English domination; and that if Henry, when he came to Ireland in 1171, had such a letter from the Pope as was stated, he need not have brought so many thousands of men with him—he had only to show the letter to St. Laurence, who, as a faithful son of Holy Church, was a model of humility and obedience, and instant submission would have followed throughout the country. But there was not so much as a whisper of such a letter during the King's visit. Father Burke argues further that if Rome had given the alleged authority to Henry, then, when St. Laurence went to Rome for the Third Lateran Council in 1179, the Pope, Alexander III., would have called him to a severe account for opposing the wishes of the Holy See, and attempting, as it were, to throttle Henry II. The eloquent Dominican adds that, so far from being blamed or reprov'd, of all the Bishops who came to the Council there was not a single man who received so much honour from the Pope as did the Archbishop of Dublin. The Pope, he says, put him in the highest place, gave him the pallium of Archbishop, ordered the Bishops of Ossory, Glendalough, and other places, to be subject to him, made him his own Legate Apostolic, and sent him back, crowned with glory, to Ireland.

Not has Father Burke any faith in a confirmatory Bull

from Pope Alexander III., the successor of Pope Adrian IV. In another discourse (New York, November 12th, 1872),¹ he remarks that Alexander had a better knowledge of Henry than Adrian had ; for Henry supported the antipope Octaviannus in 1159, and the antipope Guido in 1166, both against Alexander. History even tells that Henry obliged every man in England—from the boy of twelve years up to the old man—to renounce his allegiance to the true Pope, and go over to an antipope. Is it likely, then, asks Father Burke, that the Pope (Alexander) would give Henry a letter to settle ecclesiastical matters in Ireland?

The great Bossuet, tutor to the Dauphin of France, and afterwards Bishop of Meaux, had not a higher opinion of Henry than Father Burke had. Let us quote a few words from his panegyric on St. Thomas of Canterbury. " Henry II., King of England," he says, " declares himself an enemy of the Church. He attacks her both in spirituals and in temporals—in what she holds from God and what she holds from men. He openly usurps her power. He thrusts his hand into her treasury, which contains the sustenance of the poor. He lessens the honour of her ministers by an abrogation of their privileges, and crushes their liberty by restrictive laws. Rash and ill-advised prince ! How is it he does not foresee from afar the terrible convulsions that the contempt of ecclesiastical authority will one day cause in his kingdom, and the unheard-of excesses into which the people will be carried, when they have shaken off that necessary yoke?"²

Surely, in the judgment of every impartial reader, it

¹ *Sermons and Lectures in America*, pp. 94, 155.

² *Bossuet's Complete Works*, Migne, vii., p. 1150.

cught to appear more probable that Henry was capable of forging any document suited to his purpose, than that he received special honours from the Holy See as its agent or representative in Ireland.

Although the authority of Giraldus Cambrensis is generally of little account, still, as he was intimately acquainted with Henry II., and had rare opportunities of studying his character, it is interesting to hear what he says, and what he took good care not to say until long after Henry was laid in his grave. Among many portraits that he presents of the King, we take the following : " From beginning to end, an oppressor of the nobility ; weighing right and wrong, lawful and unlawful, by his own interest ; a seller and a delayer of justice ; changeable in speech, and full of guile ; readily breaking, not only his word, but even his pledged honour and his oath ; an open violator of his marriage obligations ; an ingrate towards God, and without devotion ; a hammer of the Church ; and a born son of perdition." Again : " Ascribing all to his own arm, like another Pharaoh, he hardened his heart, and plunged into yet greater depths of vice." Elsewhere : " Such was the perverse nature of King Henry that to his utmost he excited and fomented dissensions among his sons, hoping only from their discord to obtain quiet for himself." In fine, Giraldus points out, as a terrible judgment of Heaven, that Henry, who so much neglected his duties during life, had not at his last hour the assistance of a priest, and died without the sacraments.¹

It may not be out of place to remark that the deplorable state of religion and morality in England during the last few centuries, and especially at the present day, when millions of persons never enter a house of worship, and

¹ Giraldus Cambrensis, viii., pp. 160, 165, 176, 260, 283, 304.

the daily newspapers horrify by their record of crimes, may justly be traced to the rebellious action of Henry and some of his short-sighted successors against the Church, which alone is qualified to remedy the evils of society. Even Guizot, a French Protestant historian, treating of the Middle Ages, acknowledges the great and salutary influence of the Church. "In the midst of that deluge of material force which at this period overwhelmed society," he says, "there was an immense benefit in the presence of a moral influence, a moral power, a power which derived all its force from convictions, from belief, from moral sentiments. Had there been no Christian Church, the whole world would have been abandoned to mere material force. The Church alone exercised a moral power. She did more—she kept up and diffused the conviction of a rule, a law, superior to all human laws. She professed that belief so essential to the well-being of mankind, that there exists, above all human laws, another law . . . sometimes called reason, sometimes the divine law, but which everywhere and always is the same law under different names."¹

Rulers, as well as others, who violate the religion established by the mercy of God for the salvation of mankind, offend grievously against public order. How different is such conduct from that of the great Emperor Constantine, who, zealous for the best interest of his subjects, favoured the Church in so many ways, especially by his protective laws and his munificent gifts! The number and the variety of the latter, though not of such extent in regard to territory as was falsely alleged about five centuries after his death, were really immense. Passing over many,

¹Quoted by the Abbé Gosselin in his admirable work on the *Power of the Pope in the Middle Ages*; translated by the Rev. M. Kelly, St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, i., p. 43.

such as "patrimonies" or estates to churches in different places, at least one example may be given. The weight of the chalices, patens, cruets, basins, censers, vases, chandeliers, statues, and other ornaments that he bestowed on the splendid Basilica which he built in Rome near his Lateran palace,¹ on the spot where he received baptism, amounted to 685 pounds of gold and 12,943 pounds of silver. This list includes one lamp of the purest gold, weighing fifty pounds, but it does not include the superb gilding of the whole ceiling, which was 500 feet in length. It also omits the value of the emeralds, hyacinths, and other precious stones set in the sacred vessels, and the cost of workmanship.²

We might speak in similar terms of another illustrious Emperor, Charlemagne. Walking in the footsteps of his illustrious father, Pepin, he gloried in rendering services to the Church, which both of them regarded as the best possible instrument for the spread of true civilisation over the world. It was by their powerful arms that the Lombards were compelled to restore to Rome the rich provinces that they had usurped; for the inhabitants of these provinces, finding themselves abandoned, and left a prey, by the Emperor of Constantinople, had united for their own defence, and put themselves under the protection of

¹ This palace, which formerly belonged to a rich Roman senator, named Plautius Lateranus, came to Constantine by his wife Fausta. Adjacent to the church, Constantine also built a baptistery in honour of St. John the Baptist, with a second altar in honour of St. John the Evangelist. Eventually, the church, though dedicated in honour of Our Holy Saviour, came to bear the name of St. John Lateran. It has a pre-eminence over all the other churches not only of Rome, but of Christendom. In the time of Constantine, it contained a wooden altar on which St. Peter and his successors were said to have celebrated Mass. All other altars were to be of stone.

² *Power of the Pope, etc.*, already mentioned, i., p. 101. (Taken from Anastasius, an author of the ninth century, who wrote the *Lives of the Popes*.)

the Pope, their best friend on all occasions. Then, and afterwards, great authority was often placed in the hands of the Pope, who, by his rank, learning, and virtue, seemed so worthy of it ; and he, consulting for the welfare of society, could not refuse it. How much he was on his guard against injustice, or the very shadow of it, appeared in all his acts, which were usually distinguished by a consummate prudence. The Lombards or Longobards were so called because they shaved the back of the head, and allowed the hair in front and the beard to grow long—so that their very appearance was enough to excite horror. A fierce and rapacious people, originally from Sweden, they disturbed the peace of Italy for more than two hundred years, until at length Charlemagne put an end to their kingdom. Visiting Rome, he ordered a new and most ample deed of “restitutions,” sometimes called “donations,” to be drawn up, and, having signed it with his own hand, it was also signed by the Bishops, Abbots, Dukes, and Counts, who accompanied him. He then laid it on the Altar of St. Peter, for whose primacy he had so much reverence. As a confirmation of these proceedings, he and all his French lords swore to preserve for the Holy See all the territories mentioned in that deed.¹

Referring to England in particular, we may well say : What wonders it might have done for the amelioration of the human family, if it had always remained faithful to the Church ! What benefits it might have conferred on so many nations of the earth, which, though having a right at least to be well governed, now groan beneath its sway ! If its zeal had always been wisely directed, poor Ireland, for example, which might support twenty millions of inhabitants in peace and plenty, would not to-day have

¹ *Power of the Pope, etc., i., p. 232.*

so many causes of complaint. How lamentable to see all the energy and wealth squandered year after year by its hundreds of contending sects in propagating their different systems of religion—mere shadows, or rather counterfeits of Christianity! Will it never understand the spiritual misfortunes brought on it chiefly by the perfidious conduct of Henry VIII., and his daughter Elizabeth? Will it never recover from the illusions of its temporal or material success? Will it never, in turning over the pages of history, recall with grateful mind the days when it rejoiced in the blessings of a supernatural faith, free from the possibility of error? Will it never, when priding itself on the glories of Oxford and Cambridge, remember that most of the colleges there had Catholic founders, whose rich legacies are now distributed among officials for duties totally at variance with those intended? Will it evermore shun, with obdurate heart, that sacred and divine light—the light of eternal truth—which, through the apostolic pity and piety of St. Gregory the Great, was brought to its shores by St. Augustine of Canterbury?

But it is time to draw to a close.

That reference to any point may be made as easy as possible, I have added a Table of Contents and an Index.

If the “Bull of Adrian,” which has during so many ages tarnished the memory of an illustrious Pontiff, still finds favour with any, it is to be hoped that this treatise from the *Analecta*, accompanied with a variety of Documents, may help to give it a long *quietus*.

MOUNT MELLERAY ABBEY,

November 15th, 1905.

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

THERE is no historical document that has given rise to so many controversies as the letter of Pope Adrian IV., authorising, as we are told, Henry II., King of England, to undertake a conquest of Ireland, and commanding the Irish to submit to him as their lawful ruler.

For seven hundred years, the Irish have been calling into doubt the genuineness of this Pontifical letter. They cannot be persuaded that the Common Father of Christians, without consulting the clergy or the people of the country, without being sure whether the intervention of an English prince was asked or desired—that the Pope, I say, should, on an imperfect and inexact report, have condemned a nation, distinguished by its attachment to Christianity, to lose its independence, and become a prey to fierce and plundering Anglo-Normans.

These ideas have been developed with much warmth and bitterness by McGeoghegan, who says : —“ Behold a sentence pronounced against Ireland, by which the right of nations and the most sacred laws are violated, under the specious pretext of religion or a reformation of manners. The Irish are no more to have a country : this nation, which has never submitted to a foreign yoke, *nunquam externæ subjacuit ditioni*, is condemned, without being heard, to lose its liberty. . . . We may say that never has any Pope, before or since Adrian IV., punished a nation so severely without having deserved it. . . . We have seen

excommunications hurled against Emperors and Kings, and interdicts laid on their States, for crimes of heresy or other causes, but here we behold innocent Ireland delivered up to tyrants, without having been summoned before any tribunal, or convicted of any crime." (McGeoghegan, *Histoire d'Irlande*, tom. 1, p. 449, 451.)

Moreover, Irish writers have observed that the original document of Pope Adrian IV. has never been seen or shown by any person, not only at the time when it was first alleged, that is to say, about the end of the twelfth century, and about thirty years after the death of Adrian, but even in the course of time no annalist or historian has been able to lay his hand on the original letter. This is so true that Rymer, who, at every document of the *Fœdera*, &c., is always careful to mention in the margin *Ex Turre Londunensi*, or some other official depot—Rymer, I say, in what concerns the letter of Adrian, is unable to offer any guarantee but Matthew Paris, who lived almost a century after Adrian !

It is true that Cardinal Baronius gives in his "Ecclesiastical Annals" the letter attributed to Pope Adrian ; but the manner in which the learned annalist expresses himself shows clearly that he had not the original diploma before his eyes, and consequently that this diploma, at the time of Baronius, did not exist in the archives of the Vatican. Other writers have dated it from Rome, while it is proved that, during the period in question, Adrian was at Beneventum, where he resided for a long time. But Baronius does not supply any date : now would he have neglected a clause so essential if he had before his eyes the official register of Adrian IV., or at least an authentic copy of the letter ? This shows that he had nothing at his disposal but a *private* copy, without any seal of authenticity. The

advocates of the letter agree in saying that it was written in the year 1155, a few months after the election of Adrian. Baronius, on the contrary, has placed the document at the end of the Pontificate, and has declined all responsibility with regard to its date. Far from attaching any importance to the document, Baronius says that he inserts it so as to omit nothing attributed to the illustrious Pontiff. "Moreover," he says, "lest anything should perish from the memory of so great a Pontiff, we shall here transcribe from a manuscript in the Vatican the diploma given to Henry, King of England, regarding the affairs of Ireland, brought to a more religious state." *Ad hæc insuper, ne quid ex-cidat de tanti Pontificis memoria, hic describemus ex codice Vaticano diploma datum ad Henricum Anglorum Regem de rebus Hiberniæ in meliorem statum religionis restitutis, sed quoto sui pontificatus anno incertum.* (Baronius, *Annales Ecclesiastici*, tom. 12, p. 531, Moguntiæ, 1608.)

Thus Baronius abstains from pointing out the political character of the letter that is set forth as the act by which Ireland was given to an English King. The annalist seems to remark nothing but an improvement in matters of religion.

The defenders of the apocryphal letter, attributed to Pope Adrian IV., imagining doubtless that all the manuscripts kept in the immense library of the Vatican are original diplomas and official collections, have asserted that it was from the Vatican itself, and from a Vatican manuscript (*ex Codice Vaticano*), that Baronius took the document under discussion. But these champions of authenticity do not know that the Library of the Vatican contains thousands of manuscripts which assuredly have no official or authentic character. The original registers of

the Popes are preserved, not in the *Library*, but in the *Archives* of the Vatican. Now the series of registers begins only at the year 1198, that is to say, forty years after the death of Pope Adrian IV.

What then is the Codex Vaticanus in which Baronius found the letter attributed to Pope Adrian IV.? It is nothing else but a copy of the work of Matthew Paris!

In 1872 the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* published a very interesting and substantial article on Adrian IV., and his pretended donation of Ireland for the benefit of England: I shall have occasion more than once to refer to it in the course of my remarks. The writer of the article says that, residing in Rome a few years ago, he wished to know exactly what might have been the Vatican Manuscript (*Codex Vaticanus*) from which the copy of Adrian's letter that Baronius gave in his *Annales* was borrowed. Now the archivist of the Vatican, after many searches in the immense Library, assured him that Baronius had absolutely nothing at his disposal but the *Historia Major* of Matthew Paris. It follows hence that the testimony of the *Codex Vaticanus*, and of Baronius, who made use of it, is identical with that of Matthew Paris, that is to say, of an historian who never saw the original letter, and who wrote nearly a century after Adrian.

This proves once more that Cardinal Baronius did not find anywhere in the Vatican the original letter of Pope Adrian, with its date and other characteristics of genuineness.

It remains for me, in this introduction, to solve another difficulty, arising from the fact that the diploma attributed to Pope Adrian has been inserted in some editions of the Roman Bullarium.

Well-informed people know that the collection called

Bullarium Romanum was a private, individual compilation, whose authenticity was never guaranteed by the Popes. It may, therefore, have happened that apocryphal documents glided in. When Pope Gregory IX., in 1234, published the Decretals, he placed at their head a Pontifical Diploma which authenticated the collection. Boniface VIII. and Clement V. did the same for other canonical codes. At a later date, Leo X. declared authentic an edition of the acts of the Fifth Council of Lateran. Pius IV. followed his example with regard to the decrees of the Council of Trent, an edition of which was printed at Rome in 1564. Some years afterwards, Gregory XIII. likewise authenticated a Roman edition of the *Corpus Juris Canonici*. Under the Pontificate of Paul V., a large edition of the General Councils appeared at Rome, but in the preface it was declared that there was no intention of guaranteeing its official or juridical authenticity.

The Holy See has never taken on itself any responsibility for the various editions of the Roman Bullarium that have been published from time to time. Hence, Bulls and Briefs found there acquire no legal value, unless copies are produced in authentic form. The same rule is observed in regard to the sentences of tribunals, and the acts of ministerial officers.

The four volumes of the Bullarium of Benedict XIV. are the only exception, because this Pontiff authenticated them by a diploma placed at the head of the work.

Lingard, in his *History of England*, has not thoroughly examined the question of genuineness: he is content with bringing together some details, scattered among the chroniclers, Gervase, William of Newbridge, and especially Giraldus Cambrensis. After referring to a Council held, it is said, about the year 1175, and in which the

false letter of Pope Adrian IV. was read, Lingard makes the following reflection: How far this letter served to convince the prelates that the King of England was the legitimate Sovereign of the island, we are left to conjecture. Such a consideration would seem to betray in the mind of the historian but little confidence in the genuineness of the letter.

The curious work *Macariæ Excidium*, edited by O'Callaghan in 1850, and published in Dublin by the Irish Archæological Society, contains, in the editor's notes, everything most specious that has been said to establish the genuineness of Adrian's Bull.

Lastly, I mention the article of the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, which appeared in 1872, and to which I have referred above. Thanks to modern editions, far superior to former ones, especially in what concerns the study of manuscripts, and considering also the progress of historical criticism, the author has made some judicious remarks that confirm our reasons for doubting the genuineness of the letter attributed to Pope Adrian. He seems to me to have so completely, though succinctly, exhausted the subject, that one can scarcely hope to offer any new views.

I should not, however, take up my pen, if I had only to repeat what has been said before me. But through studies to which I have devoted myself, I hope that I shall be in some measure able to draw the attention of serious men to a few points that seem imperfectly cleared up, and to a few historical documents that have not hitherto been utilised.

Here are the conclusions on which I believe I can rely, and which, taken together, form the historical thesis that I propose to develop:—

I. Adrian IV. never gave the King of England authority

to invade Ireland. On the contrary, he positively refused all concurrence in this enterprise, the danger and the injustice of which he pointed out.

2. The letter commonly attributed to Pope Adrian is false—is apocryphal. This conclusion follows directly from the preceding one, independently of all other reasons that combine to show the falsity of the document.

3. The true letter of Adrian, refusing to let Ireland be invaded by the English, is not lost. It has been preserved by irreproachable authorities.

4. The tenor of the true letter does not permit us to suspect its genuineness. Besides, extrinsic proofs agree in confirming it.

5. This true letter of Pope Adrian IV. gives, alone, the key to a multitude of facts that have remained obscure, enigmatical, inexplicable up to this day. It reveals the motive of that mysterious silence which was kept for more than twenty years on the existence of a document from Adrian IV., relating to Ireland. It explains why Henry first caused this country to be attacked by adventurers, because the refusal of the Pope did not allow him to attempt a public and direct expedition.

6. The false letter was framed on the true. Henry II. preserved in the apocryphal Bull the preamble of the true letter, but completely changed the concluding enactment. Instead of a refusal, he announced a donation of the island, with an exhortation to the Irish to recognise the King of England as their lord and master. The falsification is flagrant.

7. None of the succeeding Popes confirmed the pretended donation of Adrian IV. In the treatise of Giraldus Cambrensis called *Expugnatio Hibernia* we find a Brief attributed to Pope Alexander III. ; but in a subsequent

work the historian evidently considered that this Brief had been designedly forged.

Such are the chief points that I propose to establish.

I may be permitted here to say a word of the occasion that decided me to undertake this work.

An Irishman, residing in Montreal, Canada, wrote to me a few years ago, calling my attention to Adrian IV., and his pretended donation of Ireland in favour of the English. He pressed me to treat of this important question, for the honour of the Holy See, and for the character of Adrian, on whose memory a grave accusation has lain for so many centuries.

At this time I was travelling ; but, having to make a delay at a city in which there were rich libraries, I began some researches, and carried them pretty far. Obligated to continue my journey, I entrusted my papers to the keeper of a library. On my return, after thirty months of absence, I learned to my great regret that the keeper had died, and that all my notes had disappeared. I should consequently begin all anew ; but this mishap has been amply compensated for by an unexpected discovery, that of Adrian's true letter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

Chap.	Page
I. MEANS THAT HENRY TOOK TO OBTAIN AUTHORITY FOR CONQUERING IRELAND	1
II. MISSION OF ROTRODUS TO ROME	3
III. WHAT THE AMBASSADOR ASKED OF POPE ADRIAN IV.	4
IV. OBJECTIONS OF POPE ADRIAN TO THE IRISH EXPEDITION	5
V. POPE ADRIAN'S LETTER	6
VI. POPE ADRIAN'S LETTER CONCERNS IRELAND	10
VII. IT IS NOT POSSIBLE THAT THE LETTER OF POPE ADRIAN RELATES TO SPAIN	13
VIII. HOW KING HENRY II. RECEIVED THE DECISION OF THE POPE	15
IX. THE WELSH ADVENTURERS	20
X. DEPARTURE OF HENRY II. FOR IRELAND	23
XI. IF THE BISHOPS OF IRELAND SUBMITTED TO THE KING OF ENGLAND	27
XII. THE OATH THAT HENRY TOOK IN THE CATHEDRAL OF AVRANCHES IS DECISIVE EVIDENCE AGAINST THE BULL ATTRIBUTED TO POPE ADRIAN IV.	30
XIII. THREE LETTERS ATTRIBUTED TO POPE ALEXANDER III.	32
XIV. HENRY II. HAD ONLY A NOMINAL POWER IN IRELAND	35
XV. CARDINAL VIVIAN	38
XVI. PREPARATIONS FOR THE FRAUD	40
XVII. DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PSEUDO-METALOGICUS AND THE FALSE BULL OF ADRIAN IV.	45
XVIII. EXAMINATION OF THE APOCRYPHAL BULL	51
XIX. DIPLOMA ATTRIBUTED TO ALEXANDER III.	64
XX. APPEARANCE OF THE APOCRYPHAL BULL IN ENGLISH CHRONICLES	67
XXI. AUTHORITY OF GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS	72

Chap.	Page
XXII. THE ENGLISH CHRONICLERS APPEAR TO HAVE ALL TAKEN THE APOCRYPHAL BULL FROM GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS	74
XXIII. PETER'S PENCE	77
XXIV. JOHN LACKLAND	78
XXV. STATE OF IRELAND IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY	85
XXVI. THE PONTIFICAL COURT OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY KNEW NOTHING ABOUT THE FALSE BULL OF ADRIAN IV.	93
XXVII. OF THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES, WITH THE BEGINNING OF PROTESTANTISM	107
XXVIII. ERECTION OF THE KINGDOM OF IRELAND BY POPE PAUL IV.	113
XXIX. CONFISCATION OF LANDS IN IRELAND	120
XXX. BRIEFS OF THE HOLY SEE ON THE WAR OF IRISH INDEPENDENCE	128
XXXI. EMANCIPATION OF THE IRISH	131
XXXII. CRITICS	136
XXXIII. THE FATE OF APOCRYPHAL DOCUMENTS	161

DOCUMENTS.

No.

1. Contains article from the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*,
November, 1872, by the Most Rev. Dr. Moran, Bishop
of Ossory—afterwards Cardinal Moran, Archbishop of
Sydney—(embodied in a new article written by His
Eminence in 1897) 165
2. Letter of Pope Adrian IV. to Louis VII. King of France,
dissuading him from an Expedition to Ireland 195
3. From Chapter XLII. of the *Metalogicus* 197
4. Apocryphal Bull attributed to Pope Adrian IV. 198
5. Remarks of Mr. Brewer and Rev. Mr. Dimock on
Giraldus Cambrensis 199
6. Remarks of Giraldus Cambrensis on the Bull of Pope
Adrian 202
7. Diploma from Clement III. (1188) 203
8. Letter of Pope Innocent III. on Peter's Pence in England
(1213) 203

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

xxix

No.	Page
9. Letter of Pope Innocent III. to the Bishops, Barons, and People of Ireland (1213)	204
10. Letter of the King of England to the Bishops of Ireland (1275)	204
11. Letter of Pope John XXII. to King Edward II. (1317) .	205
12. Letter of King Edward III. on the Troubles of Ireland (1353)	206
13. Convocation of a great State Council in Ireland (1361) .	206
14. Command given to the Barons by Edward III. to set out for Ireland (1368)	207
15. <i>Brief</i> of King Edward VI., "Head of the Church" in Ireland (1547)	207
16. <i>Brief</i> of King Edward VI. against the authority of the Pope (1551)	208
17. Consistorial Decree on the Erection of Ireland into a Kingdom (1555)	208
18. Bull of Pope Paul IV. erecting Ireland into a Kingdom (1555)	209
19. Conference of Pope Paul IV. with the Ambassadors of Queen Mary (1555)	210
20. Brief of Gregory XIII. on the Irish Insurrection (1580)	210
21. Brief of Clement VIII. (1600)	211
22. Irish National Association (1601)	212
23. Decision of the University of Salamanca regarding the Irish War (1603)	213
24. Strange Story told by Rzovius	215
INDEX	217

Pope Adrian IV. the Friend of Ireland

CHAPTER I.

MEANS THAT HENRY TOOK TO OBTAIN AUTHORITY FOR
CONQUERING IRELAND.

THE proximity of Ireland to England, and the inferiority of the Irish in the art of war when compared with knights clad in iron armour, suggested the idea of conquest to William the Conqueror and Henry I. This project, which they abandoned, was resumed in 1156 by Henry II., after he had completely subdued the Welsh.

To justify his invasion of a free and inoffensive people, Henry set forth religious interests. He considered that a moral reformation and a higher civilisation would be benefits that the Irish would gladly purchase at the cost of their independence.

Unfortunately, Pope Adrian IV., precisely because he was an Englishman by birth, was obliged to be on his guard more than any other pontiff, so as not to incur, in the eyes of contemporaries and of posterity, the grave reproach of having sacrificed to a predilection for his native country the independence of a neighbouring nation, which had furnished no pretext for war or revenge.

Henry II. understood how useful it would be for him to have an ally, if not to share in a military expedition, at

B

least to negotiate matters with Pope Adrian, and obtain his consent for the conquest of Ireland. Louis VII., King of France, was the only prince in a position to lend efficacious help. Above all things, therefore, it was necessary to gain King Louis to the project.

All the annalists have mentioned the unexpected reconciliation that took place between Louis and Henry, after years of conflict and war. The two princes met at Rouen, made peace, and concluded a marriage of their children, yet very young ; the girl was little more than six months, and the boy may have been about three years old. Adrian IV. wrote to Henry, Chancellor of the King of France, to congratulate the two princes on their reconciliation.

Robert du Mont, the Continuator of Sigebert, expressed his profound surprise on seeing the two kings give each other such great testimonies of friendship. I believe that I ought to quote an extract from this contemporary chronicler. He speaks thus :—" In the year 1158, Henry, King of the English, having subdued Wales and made it all tributary, being come to Rouen, conferred with the King of France, on Thursday, the 31st of August, between Gisors and the New Market, and also treated with the prelates of Holy Church and the barons of two provinces. Then, justice shining from the height of heaven, Louis, King of France, gave his daughter, born of Constance, his second wife, who was little more than six months of age, to Henry, second son of the King of England, who was about three years. The bishops of the two parties became guarantees for the compact. In the month of September, Henry went to Paris, to conduct into Normandy the King's daughter, whom he had accepted for his son. The King of France came forth to meet him, and rendered him great honours in the royal palace. . . . Next day, the King of France accompanied him, with his daughter, as far as Mantes. What a wonder, truly unheard of, to see the Kings of England and France united in such great affection ! In the month of November, Louis VII. went on a pilgrimage to Mount Saint Michael. Henry accompanied him everywhere." (*Patrologie*, Migne, t. 160, p. 484.)

CHAPTER II.

MISSION OF ROTRODUS TO ROME.

THE choice of a negotiator enables us to understand that the affair which Rotrodus went to treat of at Rome concerned England more than France.

The biography of this prelate is found in *Gallia Christiana*, tome XI.—as Bishop of Evreux, p. 557, and as Archbishop of Rouen, p. 48. In 1158 he was Bishop of Evreux.

He was an Englishman, son of the Earl of Warwick, and brother of Roger, likewise Earl of Warwick, and of Robert of Newburgh. He was consecrated Bishop of Evreux in 1141, at Rouen. Having assisted at the Coronation of Henry II., he fulfilled various missions for this prince. In 1157 he signed the charter of Sylvester, Abbot of Canterbury, who acknowledged the jurisdiction of the Archbishop over his monastery. In 1163 he assisted at the translation of the body of St. Edward to Westminster. Archbishop of Rouen in 1164, he continued to live in the greatest intimacy with the English court. In 1172 he crowned, at Winchester, Henry III. and his wife, Margaret, daughter of the King of France. Two years afterwards he was present at the treaty of peace between Henry and his sons. (Rymer, *Fœdera*, tome 1, p. 37.)

Rotrodus was so much the better suited for the mission with which the two Kings intrusted him to Pope Adrian, as he had just been one of Henry's representatives at the peace negotiations of 1158. We are thus informed by the *Gallia Christiana*, in these terms : " Circa id tempus, unus fuit e legatis regis Angliæ in negotio pacis tractandæ, ut liquet ex duabus epistolis Hugonis episcopi Guessionensis ad Ludovicum regem apud Quercetanum." (Tome IV., pp. 633 et 635.)

CHAPTER III.

WHAT THE AMBASSADOR ASKED OF POPE ADRIAN
THE FOURTH.

ARRIVED in Rome about the end of 1158, or the beginning of 1159, Rotrodus made known the object of his mission to Pope Adrian IV.

He therefore announced to him that the King of France was thinking of going to Ireland, in company and in concert with Henry, King of England ; and that for this purpose he was continually occupied in mustering an army, and collecting all things necessary for the expedition.

The object of the two princes was religious.¹ They wished to extend the limits of Christendom, to overcome the barbarism of pagans, to subject to the yoke and power of Christians apostate hordes who rejected the truth of the Catholic Faith.

In order the more conveniently to carry out his design, the King sought the counsel and favour of the Roman Church. This is why the ambassador begged an encyclical exhorting the people of the kingdom to join in this kind of crusade, as also a pontifical diploma by which Adrian would take the kingdom under his protection during the absence of the King.

What was the Pope's answer to such a strange communication? This is what it is important for us to note.

¹ The Abbé Vervorst, who supposes that Henry sent a special petition, speaks of his *manœuvres* thus:—"He wished to annex Ireland, and hoped with the help of the Holy Father to succeed. What motives does he set forth? The interests of the Church, and even of Ireland itself. Henry was a pious monarch, of whom no one spoke without tenderness of heart, and eyes raised to heaven. Others were ambitious, seeking their own personal advantage ; but he had nothing in view except the glory of God, and sighed only for the extension of the Church.—What a happiness for Ireland if it could only find itself under the sceptre of such a monarch!" Migne's *Histoire Ecclésiastique*, xxi. 293.—*Trans.*

CHAPTER IV.

OBJECTIONS OF POPE ADRIAN TO THE IRISH EXPEDITION.

ADRIAN began by eulogising the zeal and the pious intentions of the King. He admitted that the project had for its principle the purest root of charity, the fervour of faith, and the love of religion.

But he could not avoid expressing his surprise to see a wise and prudent prince show so much eagerness for such an enterprise. "In fact," says the Pope, "it does not appear prudent or safe to enter a foreign land, if one has not first of all sought the consent of the princes and the people of that land."

The Pope now learns that the King, not having consulted the Church or the princes of the land, is preparing to depart without the least delay, while he ought on no account to make the attempt, unless convinced of its necessity by the advice of the princes of the country, and invited by them.

This is why Adrian recommends the King to ascertain the needs of the country through the princes, and to inform himself of the wishes of the Church there, as well as of the princes and the people. Then, if a necessity be found to exist, if the bishops of the country approve of the expedition, if the princes themselves desire the intervention of the King, and urge it, in that case the King can decide according to their counsel and request, and accomplish his laudable design. Otherwise, there should be reason to fear that the expedition would be fruitless, and that the end would not be attained. The princes and the people would be aggrieved by an interference not required, and the Pope himself would with some justice be taxed with levity.

This is why Adrian thought proper to withhold the apostolic exhortation, sought for in the King's name, with a view of stimulating the people to share in the expedition. He refused the diploma of protection for the kingdom in the King's absence.

The Pontiff believed that he had excellent reasons for dissuading the King from his project. He exhorted the prince to reflect seriously on the motives that induced him to set out without the least delay.

Such were the objections that Pope Adrian made to the project of conquering Ireland. They pre-eminently indicate the great circumspection of the Pontiff, as well as his deep attachment to the rules of justice and the principles of Christian charity.

Not content with verbally expressing these objections to Rotrodus, Pope Adrian IV. thought well to formulate them in a letter addressed directly to Louis VII.

CHAPTER V.

POPE ADRIAN'S LETTER.

ALTHOUGH the ambassador had announced that the expedition to Ireland would be undertaken by the two Kings acting in concert, the Pope addressed his answer only to the King of France. Henry was given a secondary place. He had not written to the Pope, doubtless because he feared that the Pontiff would refuse an authority which might be regarded as a concession from the Pontiff in favour of his native land.

"Adrian, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our most dear Son, Louis, the illustrious King of the Franks, Health and Apostolic Benediction.

"Very laudably and profitably your Highness seems to think of propagating the Christian name on earth, and of laying up an immense reward in eternal beatitude, when, with a view of extending the limits of Christendom, overcoming the barbarism of pagans, and reducing apostate nations, which reject the truth of the Christian Faith, to the yoke and power of Christians, you make ready to set out for H,¹ with our most dear son Henry, the illustrious King of the English, and you apply yourself assiduously

¹ See next chapter.—*Trans.*

to bring together an army, and all things necessary for the expedition, in such manner that the enterprise may be crowned with success. And the more effectually to accomplish all this, you seek the counsel and favour of the most holy Roman Church, your Mother. This proposal is so much the more pleasing and acceptable to us, and we commend it as much as it deserves, because we believe that your praiseworthy intention and desire came from the purest root of charity, and that your project had for its source the greatest zeal for the faith and the greatest love for religion."

Thus Pope Adrian IV. received in perfect good faith the assurances that the ambassador gave him regarding the exclusively religious character of the expedition to be made into Ireland.¹ However, the Pontiff immediately draws attention to the danger and imprudence of such an enterprise. The Pontifical Letter continues :—

" But your Excellency, distinguished moreover by maturity of counsel and the light of wisdom, seems to hasten very much in this matter. Hence, many persons have been astonished and perplexed, because the good that is done at a proper time and in due order is always pleasing to the eternal Creator ; but, if done otherwise, it cannot be conformable to the Divine Will."

After this, Pope Adrian IV., going deeper into the subject, shows that, before undertaking the expedition, the sentiments of the country ought to be known, the dispositions of the clergy and people ought to be ascertained, there ought to be no foreign intervention unless it is desired and requested.

" Add to all this that it does not seem prudent or safe to enter another land, unless counsel has first been taken with the princes and the people of that land. But you, as we have heard, without consulting the Church of the land, or its princes, make haste to go thither, when such a thing you should on no account attempt, unless you have first

¹ It is easily seen that when the Pope refers above to pagans and apostates, he does not brand the Irish as such. He merely repeats the statement that has been laid before him, in order to make his comments on it and give his answer to it. The repetition shows that he has correctly understood the case submitted to him. Official replies at the present day follow on the self-same lines.—*Trans.*

known the need of it from the princes of the land, and been invited by them. Wherefore, because we have at heart your honour and prosperity, and do not wish to see you undertake anything but what a reasonable cause would justify, we recommend your Highness by this present letter to learn first the needs of that land from its princes, and to inquire diligently into the wishes of the Church there, as well as of the princes and the people, and, as is becoming, take their advice. Later on, if you see an imperative necessity, if such be the counsel of the Church, if, moreover, the princes of the land ask the aid of your Majesty, and approve of the expedition—then you may decide according to their demand, and, with the divine assistance, proceed to the accomplishment of your laudable desire. If you should act otherwise, there should be reason to fear that your journey would be fruitless, or that it would not come to a happy end. If perchance there were no necessity for the invasion, the princes and the people would be aggrieved by such a great military display, and we ourselves, on many accounts, might seem to have acted very lightly in a matter of grave importance.”

Adrian IV. could not have employed any arguments more convincing to put Louis VII. on his guard against the pressure of the King of England, who tried every means imaginable to extort his consent and to engage him in the enterprise. In order to show the danger of rash and inconsiderate expeditions, the Pontiff recalls the crusade of 1147, in which Louis VII. had taken part, and which had led to a dreadful catastrophe.

“Your Highness ought to remember how, at a time not very remote, when Conrad, of good memory, then King of the Romans, and yourself, without consulting the people of the country, incautiously took the road to Jerusalem, you did not attain the success that you expected, and what detriment and disaster followed for the Church of God, and for nearly all Christian people. In truth, the Roman Church itself, which had given you its counsel and favour for the expedition, was deeply compromised, and all cried out against it with lively indignation, saying that it had been the cause of such a great misfortune.”

Reflecting on the dangers of an expedition to Ireland, Adrian believed it his duty to defer the publication of the

encyclical which the ambassador, the Bishop of Evreux, asked in the name of the King, in order to prepossess the minds of the people of France, and to stimulate them, in the name of the Pontiff, to take part in the expedition.

"As the most serious reflections have shown us all that is to be feared in this matter, we have considered that the apostolic admonition and exhortation to the people of your kingdom, such as our venerable brother R., the Bishop of Evreux, has on your part proposed to us, ought to be deferred. Seeing that what is deferred for a time is not wholly denied, we shall transmit to you hereafter, if it so please God, the admonitory and exhortatory letter for the remission of sins, according to our desire of your glory, when, by the advice and invitation of the princes and people of that land, as has been said above, you wish to undertake the journey, and that you prudently and laudably prepare, through real necessity, to carry out the design conceived in your mind ; for it may be that, at the present moment, there is no immediate necessity."

Louis VII. had asked the Pope to receive the kingdom under the protection of St. Peter and his own, while he should be waging war in Ireland. Adrian IV. decided not to publish at that moment the Bull of protection ; but he declared himself willing to do all in his power for the honour and exaltation of the King, without there being any need of soliciting him. If the Pontiff had granted the Bull of protection, this concession would have been interpreted as implicitly authorising the expedition against Ireland.

"As for the letter by which, according to the petition of your Royal Highness, we should take your kingdom under the protection of the Blessed Peter and our own, threatening the apostolic anger and indignation against those who should presume to attack the kingdom in your absence, we do not feel able to grant it at present. But even without your solicitation, the lively regard that we have for your Majesty would lead us to do spontaneously, and with all the zeal and efficacy possible, whatever would be of a nature to promote your honour and exaltation, and the prosperity of your kingdom."

Adrian IV. was convinced that he had excellent reasons for dissuading the King from an expedition against Ireland. At the close of his letter he urged the prince to reflect

seriously on the motives that led him to hasten his departure.

The Pontiff could not more clearly decline all responsibility in the project of invading Ireland. As we have just seen, he not only advised the King to wait—to inform himself of the true state of the country—to consult the bishops, princes, and people ; but, lest he should be suspected of connivance in a foolish and unjust enterprise, he refused an encyclical of exhortation for the people of France. He would not even take the kingdom under the pontifical protection, during the absence of Louis.

All this shows us that the negotiation of Rotrodus was a complete failure. However, that its ill-success might not be attributed to the ambassador, Adrian bore witness that the prelate had acted with all the zeal and prudence desirable ; and to prove the consideration in which he held Rotrodus, he confided to him some verbal communications for Louis. This is what we read in the last paragraph of the pontifical letter, which, given on the 18th of February, is, according to the most ancient manuscripts, thus dated : *Datum Laterani XII Calendas Martii*.

I have been obliged to divide the Pope's letter into several parts, so as to draw the reader's attention to those points which deserve to be brought out in relief. I shall give it in full (No. 2) among the Documents at the end.

CHAPTER VI.

POPE ADRIAN'S LETTER CONCERNS IRELAND.

THE officers of the Roman Chancery who transcribed diplomas were in the habit, sometimes rather annoying for us, of giving only the initials of proper names.¹ This

¹ The following is an example from Pope Adrian's letter No. 31 :—"Adrianus episcopus, servus servorum Dei, venerabilibus fratribus E Lugdunensi et H Bisuntino archiepiscopis, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem." In the body of the letter, the Pope says :—"Dilectus siquidem filius noster P Abbas Trenorciensis monasterii sua nobis narratione monstravit, quod nobilis vir G comes Matisconensis ita terras ipsius . . . aggravet," &c.

The compiler believes that E is used for Eraclio, H for Humberto, P for Petrus, and G for Girardus.—*Trans.*

is constantly to be remarked, even in the registers kept in the Archives of the Vatican.

In what concerns the letter of Pope Adrian to which I have just referred, the old manuscripts that have preserved for us this important piece of history do not mention the country that it concerns except by the initial letter H. It is the very tenor of the document that traces the characteristics proper to make known beyond question the country to which it refers.

I say that the letter of Pope Adrian IV. concerns Ireland (H being for *Hibernia*), of which Louis VII. and Henry II. wished to make the conquest, and that it is impossible to apply the document to any other county or to any other affair.

In point of fact, what is to be remarked in the Pontifical Letter?

1. The country of which there is question is not a *kingdom*, a political society possessed of this eminent dignity. Adrian IV. repeatedly calls it by the name of *land*—the princes of this *land*, the inhabitants of this *land*, &c. Such is the official title that Ireland bore through all antiquity, and kept until the sixteenth century, when it was erected into a kingdom.

2. This same country has a Church of its own, that is to say, an episcopal hierarchy regularly constituted, and free to hold deliberations. Adrian IV. recommends that this Church should be consulted, that inquiry should be made regarding its opinion of foreign intervention. This indicates that the Church is not under any hostile domination, which might hinder its assemblies. Clearly, this Church exercises a preponderating influence, even in political affairs ; for the Pope requires that it should be consulted on the proposed intervention.

3. The country that Pope Adrian wishes to preserve from foreign intervention is not under a single chieftain or a single king ; we remark several princes, who, independently of one another, govern the districts of the country. Can it be doubted that this is Ireland? Adrian IV. recommends that these princes should be consulted, and that their consent should be obtained for the intervention ; but he gives no names—neither their personal names, nor the titles of the districts in which they rule. At the period

in question, the internal state of Ireland was little known on the continent. Rome was undoubtedly acquainted with the episcopal hierarchy, which had been reconstituted in Ireland a dozen years before ; but it had only imperfect information of the divisions of the country, and of the names of the reigning princes or chieftains. The English themselves knew no more, though living in proximity to Erin.

4. Adrian IV. wishes that the people should be consulted, and should be allowed freely to express their opinion on the utility of intervention. This supposes that the people, far from being oppressed by tyrants, enjoy the liberty that is necessary to meet in public assemblies, to deliberate on matters of general interest, and to take part in political affairs. Christians, bowed under the yoke of infidels, would not have the power of expressing their ideas on an expedition proposed with a view to their deliverance from bondage. It follows from the Pontifical Letter that these people, far from being plunged in barbarism, have, on the contrary, a considerable degree of culture or civilisation ;¹ no one thinks of consulting barbarians or beasts.

5. The great majority of the inhabitants profess Christianity. If it were otherwise, the Pontiff would not mention the *Church of that land* ; for this supposes that the ecclesiastical hierarchy comprises the whole country. However, there still remain some pagans ; but they do not form a body, a society, a government, occupying large districts. There are also some bad Christians, who conduct themselves like apostates, and, by their impious behaviour, disgrace that religion of which they make profession. This state of affairs explains and justifies the terms used in the preamble of the Pontifical Letter ; but these expressions do not imply that there is question of a country ruled by infidels, against whom a crusade ought to be preached.

6. In regard to infidels oppressing Christian provinces, the necessity of an expedition to expel them admits of no doubt ; it only remains to calculate the forces that can be employed. Here, Pope Adrian IV. continually calls into

¹ A point well worthy of being noted.—*Trans.*

doubt the opportuneness, the utility, and the necessity of the enterprise, although two powerful kings propose to unite all the forces of France and England. It follows that the country viewed in the Pontifical Letter was not one of those oppressed by Moors or other infidels.

7. There is no example in all history that any Pope has ever refused to take under his protection, and defend from attack, the kingdom of a prince setting out on a crusade against infidels. In the present case, Adrian IV. refuses the Bull of Protection which Louis VII. asks of him ; he does not permit the preaching of a crusade.

I have said above that the title of *Land* was the official and political denomination for Ireland through all antiquity, and on to the sixteenth century. Among thousands of proofs, one need only consult the collection *Fœdera*, by Rymer, in which, at almost every page, there is mention of the *Land* of Ireland.

CHAPTER VII.

IT IS NOT POSSIBLE THAT THE LETTER OF POPE ADRIAN RELATES TO SPAIN.

IN the preceding chapter I have mentioned seven characteristics attributed by Pope Adrian IV. to the country that is the subject of his letter. Now, not one of these characteristics can be applied to Spain.¹ It would consequently be absurd to maintain that the Pontifical Letter concerned an expedition that Louis VII. and Henry II. wished to undertake in concert against the Moors who were oppressing part of the Peninsula.

1. Adrian speaks of a *land*. On the contrary, Spain, in the twelfth century, had the dignity of a *kingdom*. Indeed, it counted three kingdoms : Castile, Aragon, and Galicia. As the King of Castile was the most powerful, he took the title of *Emperor*.

Robert du Mont, the Continuator of Sigebert, relates

¹ Taking H for *Hispania*. Bongars was the first to interpret the letter H of Spain. See Chap. xxxii. § 3.—*Trans.*

(1153) that Louis VII., King of France, having repudiated Eleanor of Guienne, married Constance, the daughter of Alphonsus, King of the Spains. The annalist says that Toledo is the capital of the kingdom ; and as the King of Castile is much stronger than the minor Kings of Aragon and Galicia, he is called *Emperor of the Spains*. In 1154, Louis VII. made a pilgrimage to St. James of Galicia, and was well received by his father-in-law, the Emperor of the Spains. (Robertus de Monte, in Migne's *Patrologie*, t. 160, p. 478.)

In 1170, the then "Emperor" of Spain married Eleanor, daughter of Henry II., King of England. On this occasion, Robert du Mont remarks again that Toledo is the capital of Castile. As the prince at that time was only fifteen years of age, he was presented by the King of Galicia and the King of Navarre, who were his near relations. (*Ibid.*, p. 511.)

If the expedition proposed to Pope Adrian IV. had concerned Spain, would Louis VII. have omitted to speak of the Emperor of Castile, his father-in-law, who asked his intervention? Would not a Castilian ambassador have accompanied Rotrodus to Rome, in order to remove every difficulty?

2. The country of which Adrian IV. speaks in his letter had a Church, an Episcopate, and the Pope required that it should be consulted on the proposed expedition. Now, Spain was divided into two camps. In the oppressed part, no Church, no Bishops. At least, it would have been somewhat absurd to require that the advice of any Bishops there should be taken on the subject of an expedition prepared against their oppressors.

3. If the Pontifical Letter had concerned Spain, Adrian IV. would without doubt have recommended action in concert with the Emperor of Castile, and the Kings of Aragon, Navarre, and Galicia, who were known all over Europe.

4. As for the people, it is needless to speak of the Moors, who filled the country. But the unfortunate Christians who were under their yoke—had they any opportunity of expressing their sentiments on an expedition having their deliverance for its object? We should attribute great silliness to Adrian IV., if we applied to Spain

the letter in which he requires that the people, having been consulted, should ask for foreign intervention.

5. Spain does not realise a fifth characteristic any better than the previous four. The Moors, having massacred many Christians, were the great majority in the provinces that they held. Moreover, not being idolaters, did they present the quality of *pagans*, to which Pope Adrian refers in the preamble of his letter? Where shall we find in Spain the *apostates* whom Louis VII. and Henry II. wished to subject to the power of Christians?

6. Adrian would certainly not have shown so much hesitation, if the real matter at issue had been an expedition against the Moors of Spain.

7. Lastly, he would not, in such a case, have refused to allow the preaching of a crusade, and he would have been eager to receive the kingdom of France under the protection of the Holy See during the time of the expedition.¹

I consider it useless to insist further on these reflections, and I regard as henceforth admitted for an historical truth that the letter of Pope Adrian IV. exclusively concerns Ireland, and the project of its conquest that King Henry II. entertained.

CHAPTER VIII.

HOW KING HENRY II. RECEIVED THE DECISION OF THE POPE.

THE immediate effect of the check met by Rotrodus at Rome was that Henry II., having no longer any need of an alliance with Louis VII. for an expedition to Ireland, threw off the mask ; and that extraordinary affection which he had been showing towards the King of France for about

¹ The number of reasons to show whether H was intended for Hibernia or Hispania is not limited to seven. The reader may find others for himself, of greater weight or greater difficulty. Nor is he bound to admit that every reason here given, however applicable in some respects, is perfectly valid in all. One good strong reason is worth a dozen weak ones.—*Trans.*

six months vanished as if by enchantment. A little after the return of the ambassador, Henry, forgetting his promises of friendship, laid siege to Toulouse ; but Louis VII. obliged him to retire before he could gain possession of the city.

It was during the siege of Toulouse that John of Salisbury finished his *Polycraticus*. He dedicated it to Thomas Becket, Chancellor of England, who was present at the siege of Toulouse with Henry. Becket, to whom the author was already known, hastened to engage him in various employments, and presented him to the King.

Now, if Henry scarcely knew Salisbury in 1159, how is it to be explained that four years previously he should have sent him on a diplomatic errand to Rome—to ask of Pope Adrian IV. the investiture of Ireland?

And if, on the other hand, Adrian gave Ireland to King Henry in 1155, how could he, four years afterwards, refuse him permission to undertake an Irish expedition?

The biography of Salisbury shows us the improbability of his fulfilling a diplomatic mission to Rome in 1155. He had then been absent from England for a great many years. Arrived in Gaul about 1137, he studied at Paris the dialectics and categories of Aristotle ; but, being in poor circumstances, he was obliged to earn a livelihood by acting as tutor to students. He found in the friendship of Peter de Celles, Abbot of Moutiers, some consolation in his troubles, and means of returning to England, which he revisited after an absence of twelve years. Having received Holy Orders, he hastened back to Paris, whither the desire of seeing his friends and resuming his lessons on dialectics called him.

Can anyone comprehend how Henry II., a few days after his coronation, should have chosen for a diplomatic mission to the Pope a teacher of categories, who had spent his life abroad, and who, moreover, was perhaps almost unknown to the prince?

Henry did send ambassadors to the Pope at the beginning of his reign, which coincided with that of the pontificate. But he chose for this mission three Bishops, and the Abbot of the Monastery of St. Alban. The name of a man so obscure as Salisbury was at that time could not figure in an embassy of prelates.

Rotrodus, Bishop of Evreux, who later on treated of the Irish expedition, as I have said above, was one of the ambassadors of 1155. He had for his colleagues the celebrated Arnoul, Bishop of Lisieux, the Bishop of Mans, and Robert, Abbot of St. Albans.

The authors of *Gallia Christiana*, speaking of Rotrodus, say : " As messenger from the Kings of England and France, he went to the Sovereign Pontiff in 1155, with Robert, Abbot of St. Alban's, and the Bishops of Lisieux and Mans." From the article concerning Arnoul, Bishop of Lisieux, in the *Gallia Christiana*, we learn that " he assisted at the coronation of Henry II., King of England, who, a few days after, sent him to Rome with several others, on some important affairs." (Tome 11, pp. 557, 776.)

If we are to believe some of the chroniclers of the period, especially Brompton, and William of Newbridge, the object of this embassy was to consult the Pope on a singular case. Geoffrey, father of Henry II., had, on his death-bed, required of the barons and prelates who attended him to swear that they would not let his body be buried until Henry had sworn to fulfil the secret conditions of his will. Henry consented to take the oath ; but he repented of it when he learned that his father had bequeathed Anjou, a patrimony of the family, to Geoffrey, his second son.

Henry asked absolution from this imprudent oath, on the ground that he had sworn through undue influence, and without foreseeing the consequences. Adrian granted the absolution.

But what connection has this story. more like romance than history, with the conquest of Ireland, with the donation of the island to a Plantagenet?

I remark in the acts attributed to Adrian IV., a letter, which the editor has dated 27th February, 1155, addressed to the Bishops of Scotland, in order to notify to them that they should henceforth belong to the ecclesiastical province of the Archbishop of York. (Migne's *Patrologie*, T. 188, p. 1391.)

It is unnecessary for me at present to examine the genuineness of this diploma. It suffices to observe once more that the English ambassadors sent to Rome in 1155

never treated of Ireland, nor of the conquest that King Henry II. wished to make.¹

In the *Polycraticus* addressed to Thomas Becket and the King during the siege of Toulouse in 1159, as I have said above, John of Salisbury related that he had spent three months at Beneventum with Pope Adrian, who admitted him to some great familiarities ; but he took good care in this work not to make the slightest allusion to Ireland, or to a pretended Bull that authorised its conquest. Indeed, it would have been too bold and rash if, a few weeks after the return of Rotrodus, who had just announced the formal refusal of Pope Adrian in reference to the conquest of Ireland, any one had dared to appeal to a Bull giving this island to the King of England.

In the meanwhile, Adrian IV. died. It seems to me that John of Salisbury, if he had not heard of this death, would not have alluded in the *Polycraticus* to those familiar chats which he claimed to have had with this Pontiff on delicate matters affecting the honour of the Holy See and the Roman Court.

What is certain is that it was impossible to speak of a false Bull during the lifetime of Louis VII., who had received the true and genuine letter of refusal to authorise the conquest of Ireland. This is why we find so much silence regarding the Apocryphal Bull before the year 1180, the time of the death of the King of France.

Let me here mention two facts which perhaps have some relation, and which it is not absolutely forbidden to refer to the same period.

Robert du Mont says that, about Michaelmas, Henry II. held a Council at Winchester, and treated with his barons regarding a conquest of Ireland, in order to give it to his brother William, but that, the project not being relished by the King's mother, the expedition was postponed till another time. (*Patrologie*, tome 160, page 479.)

On the other hand, it was in the same palace of Winchester that Pope Adrian's privilege was deposited, if we

¹ The author seems to imply that an object of the embassy was to bring the Church in Scotland under the authority of an English Archbishop, or else that the bull to this effect was a forgery. In either case the result was to be an extension of spiritual authority for England.—*Trans.*

are to give credit to John of Salisbury, in the chapter of the *Metalogicus*, to which I shall refer later on. In like manner, Giraldus Cambrensis says that Adrian's diploma, and the ring for the feudal investiture of Ireland, were placed in the archives of Winchester : *In archivio Wintoniæ repositus fuerat.* (*Giraldus Cambrensis*, 5th vol. of new edition, by the Rev. Mr. Dimock, p. 316.)

I suspect that this was the real letter of Pope Adrian which King Henry II. buried in the secret archives of Winchester : first, that it might remain unknown ; and secondly, that it might serve as a pattern for forging a false Bull.

However, the secret of the negotiation carried on by Rotrodus was not so strictly kept that Pope Adrian's refusal was entirely unknown. In effect, the annalist of Anchin, who continued Sigebert, speaking, at the year 1171, of the preparations that Henry II., was making for an expedition to Ireland, says that this prince arrogated to himself things not granted, and ambitioned what was not his due. "Henry, King of England, rising up in his pride, usurping things *not conceded*, and aspiring to what was not his due, prepares ships, and musters the soldiers of his kingdom, to subdue Ireland."

This passage furnishes a two-fold argument : the first, for the true letter of Adrian IV. ; and the second, against the Apocryphal Bull.

The *Continuatio Aquicinetina* was published in the *Monumenta Germaniæ* of Pertz. It was from this source that Migne took it. (*Patrologie*, tome 160, page 307.)

The refusal of Adrian IV. was a bitter disappointment to Henry II., and checked him for a long time in realising his projects against Ireland. Hence it was that he allowed nearly ten years to elapse before permitting the Welsh adventurers to begin a series of hostilities worthy of pirates and brigands, of which he should reap the profit. If one single time in his life he went to Ireland, he surrounded himself with a cloud of secrecy, in order that news of the expedition should not transpire on the continent. In the fear of being excommunicated for his complicity in the martyrdom of St. Thomas of Canterbury, he fled precipitately from Normandy and England, and took refuge in Dublin, after having ordered that all ships

should be stopped and passengers arrested, as I shall relate further on. It was therefore a necessity for him to make the expedition, and the great armament with which he landed on the coast of Ireland was intended for his personal security, not for the conquest of the country, of which, moreover, he took only a few places near the shore. He never again prepared such an armament.

In 1177, having been chosen arbiter in a case between the King of Castile and the King of Leon, Henry II. took in his decree the titles of King of England, Duke of Normandy, and Earl of Anjou, but he did not call himself Lord of the land of Ireland. (Rymer, tome 1, p. 48.)

After the death of Louis VII., which occurred in 1180, Henry II. no longer felt himself bound to such great reserve. But let us not anticipate events. For the moment I have wished to bring together some facts and signs which show that Pope Adrian refused to authorise the conquest of Ireland by the King of England.

CHAPTER IX.

THE WELSH ADVENTURERS.

It is scarcely possible to attempt an expedition into Ireland without first occupying Wales, whose hostility would constitute a real danger for an invading army. Henry II. did not entirely subdue the principality of Wales until 1156, the third year of his reign. This fact, established by all the chroniclers, renders it more and more improbable that the King, from the first year of his reign, asked Pope Adrian, either through John of Salisbury or any other messenger, for permission to undertake the conquest and subjugation of Ireland. Adrian, an Englishman by birth, could not be unaware that an invasion of Ireland is strategically impossible for anyone who is not master of Cambria.

A long time afterwards, some adventurers from Wales disembarked on the shores of Ireland, and established themselves at a few points along the coast. Thus, in our own days, Garibaldi made his expedition from Marsala

in company with a thousand volunteers, so as to prepare the way for Victor Emmanuel.

According to some chroniclers, Henry II. ordered the expedition of the Welsh adventurers. Other annalists assure us that at first he showed himself very angry on account of their piracy—to such a degree that he confiscated the property of the adventurers in England and Normandy ; but that afterwards, on hearing of their success, he removed the sequestration, requiring, however, that they should yield to him all their conquests in Ireland.

William of Newbridge, a canon regular of St. Augustin, whose chronicle reaches to 1198, says that Henry, on learning of the capture of Dublin and some other stations along the seaboard, confiscated the property of Richard,¹ the leader of the troop, and did not restore it until he had extorted (*extorsit*) Dublin and the other most important possessions. Here is what the Chronicle of Newbridge says :—

“ Ireland, which had remained inaccessible to the Romans, although they occupied the Orkneys, was never conquered, or subjected to any foreign power. . . . When Earl Richard (chief of the troop) was preparing to depart, a messenger came to him from the King, forbidding the embarkation. But Richard, caring little for what he possessed in England, embarked in spite of the prohibition. . . . He came down on Dublin with irresistible impetuosity, and compelled many persons, who, seized with fear, remained at a distance, to enter into a compact with him. . . . When news of such happy success came to the King of England, this prince, angry that Richard should have undertaken such a great affair without consulting him, and even against his prohibition, and that he had usurped the glory of an illustrious conquest, which ought rather to revert to the King, Henry, I say, confiscated the patrimony of Richard in England ; and to prevent all help that might be brought to him from England, he forbade the departure of ships for Ireland. Moreover, by a threat of the greatest punishments, he brought Richard to repentance—just at a time when a throne seemed to await him. Thus did he extort from him the city of Dublin, and other prizes

¹ Commonly called Strongbow.—*Trans.*

that seemed best in the conquest, and obliged him to be content with what remained, besides his English patrimony, which he restored in full. After this, the Earl, who, having a little while previously wasted his patrimony, seemed to possess nothing else but the name of nobility, found himself laden with English and Irish riches, and enjoyed the greatest happiness, which he lost however in a few years by a premature death. . . . A short time afterwards, the King of England passed into Ireland." (Lib. 2, c. 26.)

Benedict of Peterborough, on the contrary, relates in his chronicle that the expedition to Ireland was undertaken by the formal orders of King Henry II., and that the restitution of property preceded the departure of the Earl. "The King restored to the Earl of Chester all the castles, lands, and domains that belonged to him on this side and the other of the sea (in England and Normandy). He then commanded (*præcepit*) him to go into Ireland, in order to subdue that island for the benefit of the King." (*Recueil des historiens de France*, tome 14, p. 169.)

If we are to believe Robert du Mont, Henry II. was already treating with his barons about a departure for Ireland, when he received messengers from Richard, who said on the part of the Earl that he would transfer to the King Dublin, Waterford, and other castles that he possessed in right of his wife, daughter of the previous King of Dublin, now deceased. In reply, Henry II. promised to restore to Earl Richard his domains in England and Normandy, and the land that came with his wife in Ireland. He made him constable and seneschal for the whole island. (Robertus de Monte, in *Patrologie*, tome 160, p. 513.)

Apart from variations and contradictions, the chroniclers agree that a *bargain* between Henry II. and Earl Richard was the starting-point for English domination in Ireland.

Had Richard a right to yield to the King Dublin, Waterford, and other places that belonged to his wife, who was daughter and heiress of the petty King of Dublin? It seems to me that Richard had no right to transfer to the King of England any political authority over the County Dublin, to the prejudice of his wife and her children, or her near relations, and in opposition to the laws that prevailed in Ireland.

It would be difficult to appeal to a right of conquest ; for the aggression of the Norman and Welsh adventurers, not having been provoked by any openly declared causes, was unjust, and, from a legal point of view, was simply an act of piracy.

Moreover, according to William of Newbridge, whom I have quoted above, the cession made by Earl Richard, far from being free or spontaneous, was forced—was extorted. Richard, the Seneschal of all Ireland—this was the height of audacity ! Henry could not give what he did not possess.

CHAPTER X.

DEPARTURE OF HENRY II. FOR IRELAND.

ST. THOMAS OF CANTERBURY was martyred on the 29th of December, 1170. Pope Alexander III., on hearing of this tragic event, excommunicated the murderers, and also their counsellors, accomplices, and protectors. The Pontiff commissioned two Cardinals to inquire into the matter, and to find out the guilty. Henry II. seemed to show some satisfaction at these proceedings of the Pope. However, as he did not know what might be the instructions of the legates, or their intentions, he judged it prudent to leave Normandy before their arrival.

Gervase, whose chronicle *De Regibus Angliæ* extends to the year 1199, relates that Henry II. did not await the arrival of the legates in Normandy. “ The Roman Court,” says the annalist, “ decided on sending two legates to Normandy, in order to inquire into the murder of the holy martyr, and to punish the authors of this great crime. Henry, having heard the news, hastened to pass into England, leaving orders with the cismarine and transmarine governors¹ of ports to watch most diligently all passengers, and to arrest, and keep in prison, any man who bore letters of interdict. He also commanded them not to let any cleric pass, unless he swore that he would not cause any hurt or harm to the King or his kingdom. He forbade

¹ That is, on both sides of the Channel.

that any letter should be allowed to reach him. Henry landed at Portsmouth on the 3rd of August.

Roger of Hoveden, a native of Yorkshire, and chaplain to the Royal Family, wrote some annals, which begin in 731, at which date the work of Bede ends, and come down to the third year of King John, in 1202. We do not know the date of the annalist's birth or death ; we know, however, that he was alive in 1204.

This historian confirms the statement that King Henry II. withdrew to Ireland, so as to escape the just severity of the Holy See. "In the meanwhile," says Hoveden, "the two Cardinal Legates *a latere*, sent by the Sovereign Pontiff Alexander, namely, Gratian and Vivian, arrived in Normandy, and showed themselves very ready to proceed to vexations of divers kinds ; for they proposed to lay an interdict on the country. To shelter himself before their arrival, the King of England made an appeal to the Sovereign Pontiff in person, and by this means prevented their procedure. However, fearing the apostolic severity, he drew near to the sea, and passed from Normandy into England, commanding that no person of whatsoever rank or dignity, carrying a Pontifical Brief, should be permitted to enter Normandy from England, or England from Normandy, if he did not give security that he would not cause any evil or vexation to the King or the kingdom."

Gervase adds : "In my opinion, the chief cause of this hasty departure for Ireland was that the King wished more easily to escape the sentence of the interdict if the Cardinals published it, or more secretly there than in any other country to conform himself to it." (*Ut sententiam interdicti, si forte daretur, facilius declinaret, vel occultius observaret.*) The suspension of communications shows to what a degree Henry feared the spiritual weapons of the Legates.

It is therefore certain that Henry II. went into Ireland to hide himself, or to be out of reach—not at all to conquer the island. Indeed, during the five months that he spent in Ireland, he never quitted the seaboard. When at length, towards the end of March, 1172, he received at Wexford a favourable message, he set sail for England, through which he passed with all speed, and, crossing the

straits, arrived in Normandy, to be near the Cardinal Legates.

Henry II. could not expose himself to be made a prisoner in Ireland. He should therefore be accompanied to Dublin by an escort of knights for his personal security ; but I find it difficult to believe that this escort had the importance attributed to it by English chroniclers, and by Irish historians themselves, too much prepossessed by the idea that if their fellow-countrymen did then really submit, they yielded to superior force. For, I repeat, Henry did not go to Dublin with a view to conquer Ireland. He had neither time nor opportunity for such an attempt. At any moment he might be obliged to return to Normandy, in order to treat about his reconciliation with the Church.

In choosing Waterford or Dublin as a place of refuge, Henry showed by the very fact that Ireland did not at all belong to him. He feared that a canonical interdict would be laid on his States ; to escape the interdict, he fled to a country in which, it is true, he had some domains, but no political power. Besides, his Irish possessions being of little importance, he doubtless supposed that Rome and the Cardinal Legates were unaware that Earl Richard had made him a surrender of his conquests.

By the same fact it is shown that Pope Adrian IV. had not made him a donation of Ireland ; whence it follows that the Apocryphal Bull had not yet been imagined.

We may believe that the Cardinal Legates learned of the King's flight to Ireland. Indeed, the blockade commanded by the prince could not close the straits hermetically, and be an inviolable hindrance to every communication between the island and the continent. This, perhaps, was the reason that prevented the Cardinals from launching an interdict on the States of the English King. They reflected that he alone in his realms might escape from the effects of the sentence.

I return to the thread of events. Henry arrived in England at the beginning of August, spent two months in the preparation of an imposing escort, and in October was accompanied to Waterford by a fleet—for his personal security, I say it once more. Because the prince could not prudently expose himself to the danger of being surprised by the Irish, or by Norwegian or Danish pirates.

Must we admit as a fact historically certain that on October 17th, 1171, Henry embarked with five hundred knights, their esquires, and a numerous body of archers, in a fleet of four hundred transports? These data seem to me suspicious, exaggerated. Lingard himself, who gives the above figures, candidly acknowledges that King Henry II., five months after disembarking with his five hundred knights, and many archers, left Ireland without having added an inch of territory to the acquisitions of the original adventurers. (*History of England*, Reign of Henry II.)

On November 12, Henry II. took ship at Waterford, and directed his course to Dublin, where a temporary house of timber had been prepared to receive him. The Irish were invited to his table, and were taught to admire the magnificence and affability of the prince. Some of the Irish chiefs accepted the invitation, but the Ulster princes would not so much as visit the King.

Raoul de Diceto says that during twenty weeks from the arrival of the King in Ireland, no news reached him of his kingdom or other dominions. "Ab ingressu regis in Hyberniam viginti continuis ebdomadibus, de regno suo, vel de aliqua parte dominationis suæ quæ tam longe lateque diffunditur, ad ipsum rumor aliquis minime pervenit, nec etiam, quia ventus adversabatur, penetrare potuit." (Tome i. p. 350.)

Lingard confirms the fact. He says: "During five months, from the day of his landing at Waterford till the end of March, it was observed that not a single vessel from England or his territories on the continent had arrived on the Irish coast. So unusual a suspension of intercourse was attributed to the tempestuous state of the weather; the real cause was the policy of the King, who even at that distance dreaded the spiritual arms of the Legates." (*History of England*, Henry II.)

Such was the fear the King had of excommunication, that he would not let any one have the material means of notifying the sentence to him, of giving him information about it. It was with this view that he commanded an interruption of all communications, making no exception but for the ship that should bring him a favourable message. When he received this message, he set out at once for England and Normandy.

Behold how Henry II. occupied himself in conquering Ireland, and in receiving the submission of its chiefs and bishops !

CHAPTER XI.

IF THE BISHOPS OF IRELAND SUBMITTED TO THE KING OF ENGLAND.

As the news of the murder of St. Thomas of Canterbury had made a great noise in the world, did the Bishops of Ireland, who could not be unaware of this tragic event, gladly consent to communicate in civil and religious matters with a prince whom the public voice denounced as the instigator of the crime? We cannot without evident proof suppose that the Bishops of Ireland chose such a moment to recognise the political authority of this prince, and to submit to him as their lawful sovereign and master—and this without the force of a conquest obliging them to submit, without any advantage for religion or country.

The mystery with which the King surrounded himself—the strict blockade that he caused to be kept along the sea-side—the suspension of communications with England, with the continent, with Rome—all were of a nature to increase distrust and suspicion. Between the crime at Canterbury and the landing of Henry at Waterford, ten months had elapsed. It cannot be supposed that the Bishops of Ireland, who had frequent correspondence with the Holy See, knew nothing of Pope Alexander's feelings, the mission of the two Legates into Normandy, and the opening of judicial proceedings against the authors, abettors, and accomplices of the murder. As the blockade established by Henry II. began only in the month of August, communication with the continent had remained open and free during the previous months.

And yet it is pretended that the Bishops of Ireland took this very moment to submit to a prince who was under the stroke of excommunication, and perhaps threatened with the loss of his Crown ! Would not this inexplicable submission have been, under the circumstances, a true dereliction of duty, a baseness inconsistent with ecclesiastical honour?

This is why I am led to regard as mere fables what English chroniclers, a long time after the event, have related of the submission of Irish Bishops and Chieftains.

I put aside Giraldus Cambrensis, whose credulity¹ exceeds all bounds, and who cannot be regarded as a grave, judicious historian; but what obscurities, what improbabilities, and what contradictions among annalists who seem the most approved!

Thus, while Roger de Hoveden places an assembly of Irish Bishops at Cashel, Raoul de Diceto assures us that it was held at Lismore. Chroniclers generally agree in saying that at least Ulster refused to have any communication with Henry. On the contrary, Raoul de Diceto tells us of the eagerness, the perfect and universal unanimity of bishops and people, vying with one another to submit to the King of England. "Passim omnes unanimi voluntate, communi assensu, pari desiderio, regis imperio se subjiiciunt. Omnibus igitur hoc ordine consummatis, in concilio habito apud Lismor," &c.

¹ Giraldus tells us in all seriousness that there is a very curious kind of grasshoppers in Sicily, which, it is said, sing more sweetly with their heads cut off than when whole, and better dead than alive. Storks in Ireland, he says, spend the winter at the bottom of rivers, and come up on the return of fine weather in spring. In Germany, he assures us, where there are plenty of beavers, their tails, as having the nature of fish, are eaten on fast-days. The willow-trees, he says, round the cemetery at Glendalough, although their leaves and branches present no change, bear apples every year. At the right side of a church door on an island near Cork, there is a hollow stone, he tells us, in which is found a supply of wine every morning, according to the number of priests who will celebrate Mass there that day. There is a mill in Ossory, we are told, that will not work on Sundays, nor grind anything stolen. (Vol. v., pp. 53, 52, 59, 113, 118, 133.)

Catholics are always ready to believe in real miracles, but it does not follow that they are to believe every improbable, unconfirmed story. Giraldus had no sense of the ridiculous. We can hardly doubt that the stable-boys of the Pale who knew how to spin a yarn had many a laugh at the Welshman's gullibility. He seemed no more able to see through a joke than through a stone wall. Could such a man, so easily imposed on, be a judicious historian?

Yet we meet a writer who has a high estimate of Giraldus. Speaking of the publication of Adrian's Bull, he says, "So much importance do I attach to Gerald Barry's statement, that I give up Irish authorities for him."—(See *Dublin Review*, April, 1884, p. 340.) The statements of Irish authors must be very unreliable indeed if they cannot compare in veracity with those of Gerald Barry.—*Trans.*

It is unnecessary for me to discuss the contradictions of English chroniclers ; such an examination would lead me too far away from my subject. I pause, therefore, at one point, which furnishes an argument against the Apocryphal Bull, too long attributed to Pope Adrian IV.

Hoveden speaks of a Council held by the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland. He names them all, together with their Sees, to the number of thirty-two. Four were Archbishops and twenty-eight Bishops. These figures seem surprising for a country which some people are pleased to represent as sunk in barbarism ; according to Giraldus Cambrensis, an innumerable number of monastic abbots assisted at the same Council. Hoveden then speaks as follows : —“ All these, Archbishops and Bishops, to the number of thirty-two, receive Henry, King of England, and his heirs, as kings and lords in perpetuity, and confirm their act by their charters. . . . The King of England sends a copy of the charters of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland to Pope Alexander ; and the Pontiff confirms to him and his heirs the kingdom of Ireland, according to the form of the charters of the Archbishops and Bishops of Ireland.”

These charters of the Irish Bishops, nobody has ever seen ; no forger has ever tried his hand on them. But if, in 1172, Henry II. had no other title to send to Pope Alexander than the voluntary submission of the Bishops, this is a proof that the Apocryphal Bull of Pope Adrian IV. was unknown, and that the idea of inventing it was yet to come. A good number of years should still elapse before the appearance of this Bull in English chronicles, as I shall say further on.

For the rest, Hoveden ends by acknowledging that Henry II. made no conquest in Ireland, and did not add an inch of land to that acquired by the first adventurers. “ Before quitting Ireland, Henry gave, and confirmed by charter, to Hugh de Lacy, all the land of Meath, with its dependencies, to hold in fief and succession, for himself and his heirs, by the service of a hundred soldiers. And he committed to his care the city of Dublin, and appointed him Justiciary of Ireland. And he confided to the care of Robert, son of Bernard, the city of Waterford

and the city of Wexford, with their dependencies, and he ordered strong castles to be built there."

Such were, according to the English chronicler, the only disposals made by Henry II., who came, it is said, to subdue all Ireland !

CHAPTER XII.

THE OATH THAT HENRY TOOK IN THE CATHEDRAL OF AVRANCHES IS DECISIVE EVIDENCE AGAINST THE BULL ATTRIBUTED TO POPE ADRIAN IV.

(1172.)

AFTER waiting five months, Henry II., at the end of March, received in Wexford a favourable message. He set out forthwith on Easter Monday, crossed England and the Channel with great haste, and reached Normandy.

In the Cathedral of Avranches—the Sunday previous to the Assumption—before the legates, bishops, barons, and people—his hand on the Book of the Gospels—he solemnly swore that he was innocent in word and deed of the murder of the Archbishop.

The silence observed in this oath with regard to Ireland shows that Pope Adrian had not given the island to the King of England, and, consequently, that the Apocryphal Bull was not yet invented.

In point of fact, Henry, doing homage for the kingdom of England to the Holy See, and placing his kingdom under the Pontifical Sovereignty, would not have neglected to join Ireland with it, if this land had lawfully belonged to him by Pontifical concession ; the double offering would have facilitated the reconciliation, the absolution, the rehabilitation of the prince.

The following is the formula of the oath, such as Baroni and Muratori give it, from documents in the Vatican :—

"I, H., swear on these Holy Gospels of God that I did not premeditate the murder of Saint Thomas, that I did not know of it, and that I did not command it ; that, on receiving information of this crime, I felt a sorrow as acute, a sadness as great, as if I had heard of the murder of my own son. But what I cannot excuse in myself is

that he was put to death by occasion of the resentment and anger that I had conceived against the holy man. I appear therefore to have given occasion to his death ; for this fault I shall send, at my expense, and without delay, two hundred knights to Jerusalem, for the defence of Christendom, and I shall maintain them for one year. I shall take the cross for three years, and I shall set out for the Holy Land, unless the Sovereign Pontiff dispenses me. All the illicit customs that during my reign I have introduced into all my land I entirely make void, and forbid their observance henceforth. I shall allow full liberty to carry appeals to the Apostolic See, and shall not prevent any person in this matter. Moreover, I, and my eldest son, the King, swear that we shall receive and hold the kingdom of England from the Lord Pope Alexander and his Catholic successors, and we and our successors in perpetuity shall not regard ourselves as true Kings of England until they themselves hold us for Catholic Kings."

The oath of Henry II. is found among the letters of St. Thomas of Canterbury (v. 88. 89), and in those of Salisbury (200), but without the last article, relating to feudal subjection. The Legates, it is believed, promised that this article should be kept secret.

Baronius published the oath and the additional article from the Acts of Pope Alexander III., which he found in the archives of the Vatican. Muratori published them again, during the last century, in *Rerum Italicarum Scriptores* (tome III, first part, p. 463). Here is the text of the article :—"P̄cetera ego. et major filius meus rex iuramus quod a Domno Alexandro Papa, et ejus catholicis successoribus recipiemus et tenebimus regnum Angliæ, et nos, et nostri successores in perpetuum non reputabimus nos Angliæ reges veros donec ipsi nos catholicos reges tenuerint."

At the end of the same year, Henry II. wrote to Pope Alexander III. in order to implore his help regarding a war that his eldest son, having rebelled, was waging against him. In the letter he recognised the sovereignty of the Holy See over the kingdom of England, as a thing perfectly understood between him and the Pope. The letter being among those preserved by Peter de Blois,¹

• Secretary to Henry II.—*Trans.*

there is no reason to suppose that the extra article was an after insertion in the oath of Avranches. "Vestræ jurisdictionis est regnum Angliæ, et quantum ad feudatarii juris obligationem vobis dumtaxat obnoxius teneor et astringor. Experiatur Anglia quid possit Romanus Pontifex, et quia materialibus armis non utitur, patrimonium B. Petri spirituali gladio tueatur." (Petrus Blesensis, epist. 136 ; Baronius, 1173, No. 8 ; Lingard, *History of England*, Henry II., note 164.)

The silence that in this letter King Henry II. observed with regard to Ireland is particularly remarkable. At the period in question, the dominion of the prince in Ireland seemed almost entirely lost. The castles fortified in Meath had been burnt down. Dublin endured several assaults, and the governor of the royal possessions found himself obliged to take refuge in the castle of Waterford.

Now, if the King had received Ireland from Pope Adrian, and if he had been a feudatory of the Holy See in this land, as he was in England, would he have neglected to beg the protection of Pope Alexander against the Irish rebels?

CHAPTER XIII.

THREE LETTERS ATTRIBUTED TO POPE ALEXANDER III.

(1172 OR 1173.)

In 1728, Thomas Hearne published at Oxford the Black Book of the Exchequer (*Liber Niger Scaccarii*), in which there are three letters, said to be of Pope Alexander III.—one to the King of England, one to the Archbishops of Ireland and the Bishop of Lismore, and one to the Kings and Princes of Ireland. The three letters bear the same date : Tusculum, the 12th of the calends of October, that is, the 20th of September. It is believed that they may be referred to the year 1172—in which case they would have been written about a month after the reconciliation at Avranches.

I need not discuss the genuineness of the three letters. Although they have come to us only as copies, and have not seen the light for five hundred and fifty-six years after

the time at which they were written ; although they contain invectives against the Irish people such as are never met with in Acts of the Holy See, at least as regards expression and form ; although they state facts evidently false or controverted, which would allow the charge of their having been surreptitiously or obreptitiously obtained, supposing that they were really genuine,—I am willing to grant that the three letters are true, and I employ them to prove that the false Bull of Adrian still remained unknown.¹

In point of fact, not one of the letters mentions the Bull, or makes any allusion to it. Alexander III. recommends King Henry II. to preserve the rights of the Holy See in Ireland, and to extend them, if possible ; but he takes as his ground that all islands belong more particularly to the Pope than continents. This refers to a donation of the Emperor Constantine, which the Decree of Gratian, published about 1151, had made known everywhere. The passage is as follows :—

“ And since, as your Highness knows, the Roman Church has a different right over an island from that which it has over a vast mainland, we confidently hope from your devotedness that, not only will you preserve the rights

¹ In a theological sense, a grant is usually said to be *surreptitiously* obtained when something that ought to be manifested is concealed in the petition, and *obreptitiously* obtained when something false is asserted.

Nothing can be more absurd than to assert that if the Pope, in granting a dispensation or any other favour, makes no comment on the statements that accompany the application for it, therefore every one of those statements is admittedly true.

A bull is so called from its leaden or golden seal (*bullæ*), having on one side an image of the Holy Apostles Peter and Paul, and on the other the name of the Pope, and made pendant by a hempen or silken string. A brief is signed by the “ Secretary of Briefs,” and, as it bears a red wax seal, having an image of St. Peter fishing, it is said to be given under the Ring of the Fisherman. Bulls are issued on matters of great importance ; briefs on affairs of less serious character.

The Roman *Bullarium* is a large collection of bulls. It has been compiled by learned, virtuous, diligent men, greatly assisted by others, and accordingly much reliance may be placed on it ; but still it is only a private collection, not authenticated by the Holy See. How foolish therefore to argue that because a document is found in the Roman Bullarium, it is therefore undoubtedly genuine ! We may say the like of other valuable works on ecclesiastical matters, for which the Holy See is in no way responsible.—*Trans.*

of this Church, but you will also labour to extend them ; and where there are none, you will think of establishing them, in such manner that we may return ample thanks to your Highness, and you may be seen to offer to God the first fruits of your glory and your triumph."

The allusion to a donation of Constantine renders this letter very suspicious. I have not remarked in the forty volumes of the Roman Bullarium a single *certain* diploma, declaring that all the islands of the world belong to the Pope. Urban II., it is said, gave the investiture of Corsica to the Pisans, on the ground of the universal sovereignty of the Holy See with regard to islands ; but the Bull attributed to Pope Urban II. on this matter is apocryphal, as I shall show further on, when I examine the false Bull of Adrian IV., which rests on the same pretension.

In the Apocryphal Bull, Adrian ordered the establishment of Peter's Pence in all Ireland, such as it existed in England. Can anyone imagine that Pope Alexander III., some twenty years after Adrian, has no knowledge of this pontifical right, and does not recall it when he is recommending the King to preserve the rights of the Roman Church in Ireland? This proves evidently that the Apocryphal Bull of Adrian continued unknown as well at Rome as in England and Ireland.

The second letter, as I have said, is addressed to the four Archbishops of Ireland, and the Bishop of Lismore, who was perpetual Legate to the Holy See. Now, Pope Alexander founds the obligation of obedience to the King of England not, assuredly, on a donation of Pope Adrian, but solely on the voluntary acknowledgment and spontaneous submission that the bishops and princes have testified towards this prince.

The chronicler of Anchin, who continued Sigebert, says that King Henry II. failed in Ireland. I have quoted a fragment of the annalist above. The following is the passage in full :—" Henry, King of England, rising up with excessive pretensions, laying hands on things not conceded, and aspiring to what was not his due, prepared ships, and assembled the soldiers of his kingdom, to subdue Ireland ; and, in the hope of wearing the royal diadem, he penetrated into Ireland. But learning that the people of the country were much inclined to rebellion, and, on the

other hand, fearing a want of bread that threatened the country, as also lest, when coming back, there should be stormy weather at sea, he returned with confusion into his own kingdom."¹ (*Patrologie*, t. 160, p. 307.)

CHAPTER XIV.

HENRY II. HAD ONLY A NOMINAL POWER IN IRELAND.

(1173-1180.)

LINGARD, always moderate in his estimates and statements, says of Henry II., that he "left the island without having added an inch of territory to the acquisitions of the original adventurers. His nominal sovereignty was, indeed, extended over four out of five provinces, but his real authority was confined to the cantreds in the vicinity of his garrisons. There the feudal customs and services were introduced and enforced; in the rest of the island the national laws prevailed, and the Irish princes felt no other change in their situation than that they had promised to a distant prince the obedience which they had previously paid to the King of Connaught.² . . . The castles which had been fortified in Meath were burnt to the ground: Dublin was repeatedly insulted: four English knights, and four hundred Ostmen, their followers, fell in a battle in Ossory;³ and the governor himself was compelled to seek refuge within the castle of Waterford."

Far from thinking of conquering Ireland, Henry II.

¹ The character of Pope Alexander III. is thus described by Voltaire, an unexpected admirer, in his *Essay on General History*:—"Perhaps the man who, in those gross times, called the Middle Ages, deserved most of the human race, was Pope Alexander III. It was he who in a Council of the 12th century abolished slavery, as far as was possible. It was this same Pope who, by his wisdom, triumphed in Venice over the violence of the Emperor Barbarossa, and who compelled Henry II., King of England, to ask pardon of God and men for the murder of Thomas Becket. He upheld the rights of peoples, and put down the crimes of Kings. . . . If men entered again into their rights, it is chiefly to Pope Alexander that they are indebted for them. It is to him that so many cities owe their splendour." (x., 998.) And is it to be said that to him Ireland owes many of her misfortunes?—*Trans.*

² The historian does not examine whether the story of this submission is true or false.—*Trans.*

³ In 1174.

employed all his forces to subdue the Welsh, who had rebelled. Lingard says : " Henry exercised his vengeance on his numerous hostages, the children of the noblest families in Wales. . . . By his orders the eyes of all the males were rooted out, and the ears and noses of the females were amputated." (*History of England.*)

According to Roger de Hoveden, Henry II., in 1175, held at Windsor a great Council, at which the Archbishops of Tuam and Dublin—Cantordis, Abbot of St. Brendan—and Master Laurence, Chancellor of Roderic, King of Connacht, were present. The record of the chronicler supplies me with a new proof against the genuineness of the Bull attributed to Adrian IV. ; for this Bull was not mentioned a single time, and the English never availed themselves of it in these solemn negotiations of peace. Still more, the clauses of the Bull were violated by the articles of the treaty. In effect, Adrian IV. had, in the Apocryphal Bull, twenty years before, prescribed that every house in Ireland should contribute to the Peter's Pence, as in England. Henry II. did not say a word of it in his treaty with Connacht : he claimed for himself a tenth cowhide or sheepskin. If the Bull of Adrian had been published in a Council of Irish Bishops, as Giraldus Cambrensis assures us, would the Archbishops of Dublin and Tuam have allowed this treaty to pass over the pontifical contribution in silence?

At this time, Henry II. and his barons possessed nothing in Ireland but Dublin, Wexford, and Waterford. We may so conclude from the stipulation of the treaty, as related by Hoveden. (Page 312.)

This annalist is useful, because he serves as a check on Giraldus Cambrensis. The King's chaplain did not depend on the credulous Welshman, well as he knew the work *Hibernia Expugnata*, which was published years before the death of the English chronicler.

Giraldus relates that the Bull of Adrian was sent into Ireland—carried by William Fitz-Aldelm, and Nicholas, Prior of Wallingford ; and that it was publicly read in a Council of Bishops at Waterford, by John of Salisbury, who was sent to Rome for it, and who had also brought the ring of investiture : a ring deposited, with the Bull, in the archives of Winchester.

We might accordingly suppose that John of Salisbury, arriving from Rome at this moment, published in a Council of 1175 the Bull which he had just obtained from Pope Adrian IV., who died about fifteen years previously.

The ancient annals of Ireland have not recorded any general assembly of bishops in 1175. It is improbable that the bishops would have chosen the city of Waterford as a place of meeting, because it was in the power of Welsh and Norman adventurers.¹

¹ A certain learned writer, who is an earnest advocate for Adrian's grant, admits that St. Laurence O'Toole, who became Archbishop of Dublin in 1161, was a "persistent opposer of English rule in Ireland." Now, can any one suppose that the Saint would have been such, if he believed that Henry had any authority from Rome to rule in Ireland? And if any man in Ireland knew the sentiments of Rome, surely it was the Archbishop of Dublin. In point of fact, St. Laurence, when commissioned in 1171 to make terms with Strongbow, required that he and his followers should surrender all the places they had taken, and quit the island by a certain day.

As wonders will never cease, the aforesaid writer contends that in the whole domain of history there is no fact better proved than Adrian's grant. Yet, preferring a more mild and euphemistic term, he continually speaks of it as Adrian's *Privilege*—the privilege, shall we say, of robbing and killing the Irish, under the Christian plea of civilising them? Thus, he informs us that Henry, implicated in the murder of St. Thomas, and hastening out of reach of the Legates, "in order to do something to propitiate Rome, and at the same time gratify his ambition, prepared to go in person to Ireland, and carry out the reformation for which he had obtained a privilege from Pope Adrian." High time indeed to set to work in 1171, if the privilege was received in 1155, and a strange method indeed of appeasing that Pope who, if we may believe Voltaire himself (a man not likely to give undue praise to a Pope), "put down the crimes of Kings and upheld the rights of peoples!" We now learn that this royal reformer (who had such need of reforming himself) was accompanied by a fleet of 400 vessels, carrying "mail-clad knights in hundreds and tens of thousands of archers." Though puzzled somewhat by the numbers here given, and amazed at the novelty of the plan, we look about for the magnificent reformation to follow. Do we find it? Alas, the words of Abbé McGeoghegan, the distinguished French historian, immediately occur to us, "A bad Christian makes a bad Apostle." Far from finding any reformation, we find only the beginning of a long-continued and atrocious deformation, ruinous alike to the spiritual and the material welfare of the Irish people. And is it possible that any Pope could be so wanting in prudence as to sanction such an enterprise, or not to foresee the dire results that should certainly be expected from it? (See *Dublin Review*, April, 1884, p. 318.)—*Trans.*

CHAPTER XV.

CARDINAL VIVIAN.

THE old Irish annalists mention in 1177 the arrival of Cardinal Vivian, who convoked a council of bishops and abbots, and made various ordinances, which are now unknown. I borrow from the Rev. Mr. Dimock, the most recent editor of Giraldus Cambrensis, the following note : " The Four Masters, A.D. 1177, say : Cardinal Vivian arrived in Ireland. A synod of the clergy of Ireland, both bishops and abbots, was convened by this Cardinal on the first Sunday in Lent, and they enacted many ordinances not now observed." (Works of Giraldus, vol. v., p. 345.)

Giraldus pretends, on the contrary, that Cardinal Vivian, in the council, publicly (but verbally) proclaimed the right of the King of England over Ireland, and the confirmation of the Pope, with a strict precept, as well for the clergy as the laity, under pain of anathema, to be faithful to the King. (*Ibid.*)

A *verbal* command, a precept sanctioned by anathema, is a thing very strange ! Yet Giraldus had studied canon law : this is evident from his works. Moreover, the assertion has no guarantee but the word of the author, which cannot be admitted without a most strict examination. He also says at the same year (1177) that two important regions of Ireland, namely, Ulster and Connacht, had remained inaccessible to the English, whose attacks were constantly repelled. It is difficult to suppose that the inhabitants should submit to the King of England by order of the Cardinal.

Vivian spent a great many years in England, in Scotland, and in Ireland, as Pontifical Legate. Giraldus undoubtedly calumniates him when he accuses him of a covetousness that made him very eager for money and other gifts.

Hoveden speaks of Cardinal Vivian, and his voyage to Ireland in 1177. Far from mentioning a pretended council in which the right of England over Ireland was proclaimed, and sanctioned by anathema, the annalist relates the misadventures of the Cardinal. " The same year," he says, " Vivian, named above, Cardinal Priest of the

title of Saint Stephen, on Mount Celius, Legate of the Apostolic See, spent the festival of Christmas in the Isle of Man, with King Guthred. After the Epiphany, he set sail for Ireland, and landed at Down, in Ulster. As he was going along to Dublin by the seaside, he met the troops of John de Courcy, who stopped and held him ; but John de Courcy delivered him and let him go his way. Before the Purification of Saint Mary, John de Courcy besieged and took the city of Down, the capital of Ulster, where rest the bodies of the holy confessors Patrick and Columba, and also that of Saint Brigid, virgin. On hearing this, Roderic, King of Ulster, assembled a great army of Irishmen, and gave battle to John de Courcy, who lost a considerable part of his army, but gained a complete victory. . . . The Bishop of Down was taken in the combat, but John de Courcy delivered him at the petition of the Cardinal." (Hoyden, p. 320.)

Behold how Henry II. was lord and master of Ireland ! In reality, the King had power only in the district of Cork and in Meath. Hoveden relates, about the end of 1177, that the King gave Meath to Hugh de Lacy, and also disposed of the district of Cork, except the city. He offered the kingdom of Limerick to William and Herbert, brothers of Reginald, Earl of Cornwall. He afterwards offered it to Jocelyn de la Pomeroy, their nephew. As all refused it, the King applied to Philip de Breusa. In the meantime, a relative of the deceased ruler possessed himself of the place, and governed it, without making any submission to the King of England or his ministers, because of their duplicity, and the evil they had done without cause to the people of Ireland. "*Quidam de progenie illius (regis Monoculi occisi a regalibus), vir potens et fortis, regnum de Limeric invasit, cepit, et potenter rexit, nullam subjectionem faciens regi Angliæ ; nec suis obedire voluit, propter infidelitatem eorum, et mala quæ faciebant populo Hiberniæ sine merito. Rex vero Corcensis et alii multi divites Hiberniæ insurrexerunt in regem Hiberniæ,¹ et suos : et erant novissima eorum pejora prioribus, et se mutuo interfecerunt.*" (Hoveden, p. 324.)

¹ This word is evidently a mistake. Angliæ is the word in the edition of Roger de Hoveden, by William Stubbs, M.A. London : Longmans, 1869. Vol. ii., p. 136.—*Trans.*

I have named Hugh de Lacy : his tragic death reveals the proceedings to which Henry II. had recourse in order to extend his domination in Ireland. Here is what we read in William of Newbridge, at the year 1183 :—" Hugh de Lacy was regarded as the principal and most powerful of the barons of the King of England that were in Ireland. After the death of the valiant Earl Richard, the King had given him vast possessions, and entrusted him with the administration of his domains. But in a little while De Lacy so extended his limits, and so increased his riches and his forces, that he made himself feared not only by his enemies, but even by his own companions, that is to say, the other barons of the King ; for he ill-treated them, if they did not obey him in everything. He seemed to labour in Ireland for himself rather than for the King of England, and it was positively asserted that he was aiming at a royal diadem. When the King was informed of this, he recalled Hugh to England, but De Lacy despised the command. Shortly afterwards, fortune favoured the King of England ; De Lacy was assassinated through the perfidy of a young man whom he had made his friend, and who belonged to a band of confederated Irish. Henry then happened to be at the extremity of England. On hearing of the murder of De Lacy, he manifested extraordinary joy. Affairs in Ireland soon received from him a more circum-spect organisation." (William of Newbridge, lib. 3, c. 9.)

All these facts, attested by English chroniclers, and even by those who were dependent on the Court, show the precarious state of English rule in Ireland under Henry II. They cannot be reconciled with the hypothesis of a Pontifical Bull that had made a donation of the land of Ireland to the King of England.

CHAPTER XVI.

PREPARATIONS FOR THE FRAUD.

(1180.)

I HAVE said (Chapter VIII.) that it was not possible, during the life of Louis VII., King of France, who had received the true letter of Adrian IV., containing a distinct

refusal to authorise the expedition to Ireland which this prince had proposed to undertake in alliance with Henry II. —it was not possible, I say, to allege a Bull of the same Pope Adrian IV., making a present of Ireland to the King of England, permitting him to invade the land, and enjoining on the Irish to submit to him as their master. For the fraud would have been immediately discovered and unmasked by an irrefutable witness.

Hence, we have been unable to discover any trace of the Apocryphal Bull in records previous to the year 1180, which was that of the death of Louis VII. The Bull was passed over in silence, even at a time when Henry II. would have had the greatest interest in producing it, and availing himself of it.

It was only a good many years after the death of Louis VII., and about thirty years after that of Pope Adrian IV., that Giraldus Cambrensis, Chaplain of the English Court, first inserted the false Bull in his history of the conquest of Ireland.

After the death of Louis VII., there was no longer any inconvenience in *speaking* of a Bull from Adrian. However, before producing it, it was necessary, first of all, to reveal its existence, and gradually to prepare public opinion for the reception of the apocryphal document.

Behold a difficult question : was John of Salisbury charged to announce the Bull? Is he really the author of that chapter in his *Metalogicus* which says that, at his request, Pope Adrian IV. granted the Bull?

Let us first see if Salisbury's antecedents place him beyond the reach of a suspicion of complicity in the fraud.

I have said (Chapter VIII.) that John of Salisbury spent a great many years out of England, and that the publication of his *Polycraticus*, in 1159, drew on him the attention of Thomas Becket, then Chancellor, who attached him to his service, and gave him several employments.

It is generally believed that he had been secretary or chancellor to Theobald, the predecessor of Saint Thomas in the primatial See of Canterbury. In point of fact, we remark in Salisbury's voluminous correspondence a very large number of letters that he wrote to Pope A. in the name of Archbishop T. Unfortunately, these initials apply equally well to Pope Alexander and Archbishop Thomas as to Pope Adrian and Archbishop Theobald.

There is room to doubt if, after 1159, Salisbury acted as secretary to Theobald. Could he be in the service of this prelate, and at the same time be attached to the Chancellor Thomas Becket? We have no other guarantee that the last chapter of the *Metalogicus*, written perhaps at a time when it was a matter of interest to make people believe that in the closing years of Theobald, say 1160 or 1161, Salisbury wrote that chapter in his work which mentions the donation of Ireland to King Henry II. and the Bull of Pope Adrian IV.

What is certain is that Becket attached Salisbury by several employments, and, from the time of his nomination to the Archbishopric of Canterbury, took him as secretary. I do not like to see that Salisbury (letter 150) confided to his friends that he neglected no means of moderating the zeal of the prelate, warning him that his ardour would cause him to lose the friendship of the King.¹ However, he did not abandon his protector in the hour of disgrace. He shared proscription with him, and sought a refuge in France. After five years of exile, he rejoined Thomas Becket in England, and was, a little while later on, a witness of his tragic death. John of Salisbury continued to be attached, as a simple cleric, to the church of Canterbury, until, in 1176, King Henry II. nominated him Bishop of Chartres. I am not unaware that the clergy and people elected him according to the canonical forms then in use, and that Louis VII. wrote him a letter, which is still preserved, to overcome his hesitation ; but are not these very incidents of a nature to rouse suspicion, and make us suppose that there was a desire to disguise the true cause of the unexpected elevation of Salisbury to the episcopal See of Chartres?

It would be a sad question to ask if the Bishopric of Chartres was the price of a bargain between Henry II. and Salisbury, the latter taking on himself the obligation of favouring the King's views regarding Ireland ; and that he did so by writing the famous chapter of the *Metalogicus* which has been so often adduced to accredit and authenticate the false Bull of Adrian IV.

¹ It must be admitted that Salisbury occasionally showed himself rather loose-tongued. Examples are easily found in his letters.—*Trans.*

In the edition of the *Metalogicus* printed at Leyden in 1639, *ex officina Joannis Maire*, I find a biographical notice borrowed from the Protestant writer, John Bayle, *De Scriptoribus Angliæ*, part iv. Needless to say that I disavow beforehand the *headstrong ravings* with which the editor reproaches St. Thomas of Canterbury in regard to "the best of kings." His words are :—" Archiepiscopo Thomæ quandoque familiaris fuit, et in exilio comes: sed non propterea omisit suas illi objicere pervicaces in regem benignum dementias. Factus demum ob reconditam eruditionem ab Henrico rege Carnotensis episcopus, in provincia Senonensi, ultima doctrinæ monumenta illic reliquit. Obiit celeberrimus vir, anno a salutifero divæ Virginis partu 1182, et episcopatus sui anno sexto, sub Henrico rege prædicto."

Among various hypotheses, the last is that which I prefer, for the honour of religion, and for the honour of Salisbury himself.

It is not impossible that Salisbury wrote Chapter XLII. of the *Metalogicus* in 1176, before quitting England for Chartres, and left the manuscript with Henry II., who, in this hypothesis, would have engaged to publish it at a suitable time.

It may be, absolutely speaking, that Chapter XLII. was written at Chartres after the death of Louis VII., especially if Salisbury really lived to 1182, as Bayle says, contrary to the general opinion, which places the prelate's death in 1180, according to his mortuary inscription.¹

Although these hypotheses are not without foundation, I prefer to say that Chapter XLII. is an extra work, for which Salisbury is not responsible, because this pretended Chapter XLII. was likely added to his treatise some years after his death.

In point of fact, Chapter XLII. has not the slightest relationship with the subject of the book, whose object is to defend logic, metaphysics, dialectics, the categories of Aristotle, and philosophers themselves, Peripatetics as well as Platonists, against the attacks of the ignorant. Hence it is that Chapter XLI. naturally ends the work, with

¹ The death-register of the monastery in which John of Salisbury was buried, says that he died on October, 25, 1180. (*Patrologie*, Vol. cxcix, pref. xi.)—*Trans.*

a conclusion truly Christian, and very remarkable on the lips of one who had formerly been a listener to Abelard.¹

"Certain things," says Salisbury, "cannot be known, because of their eminent dignity. Others are not within the capacity of man, within the reach of his flighty and inconstant mind. To what then must he chiefly attach himself? What thing is most useful? Ecclesiasticus teaches, saying : *Seek not the things that are too high for thee, and search not into things above thy ability. . . .* And as the senses as well as the reason of man frequently wander, the first foundation of the understanding is faith. Hence the maxim of the Wise Man : *They that trust in God shall understand the truth, and they that are faithful in love shall rest in Him.*"

Candidly, after a peroration so philosophical and so Christian, is it natural that in Chapter XLII., tears should flow over the evils of the time, the siege of Toulouse, the rupture between the Kings of France and England, the death of Pope Adrian, and the schism threatening the Church? Then, taking occasion from the death of the Pontiff, the author relates, in terms altogether out of place and ridiculous, the kindness that Pope Adrian had manifested for him, so far as to eat from the same plate and drink from the same cup as his friend ! These trivialities are followed by an article of paramount importance, nothing more or less than a donation of Ireland in favour of King Henry II. In fine, the author repeats to satiety

¹ An able and admired writer in prose and verse, almost equally eloquent in Latin and in Greek, John of Salisbury was just the man of his times whom a forger would use to say something advantageous for Henry ; and the end of a manuscript was just the place where a forger could most safely carry out his design, by adding a new chapter without any signs of erasure or interpolation. Unfortunately, the test of handwriting cannot now be applied, as none of the earliest MSS. exist. Those in the British Museum are marked "copies."

That some forgeries were really committed in John's name, we are solemnly assured by himself, when he says in a letter to Henry, regarding some letters that the King had received :—*Ecce, Domino inspectore et iudice, loquar in auribus vestris quod verum est. Litteras istas nec scripsi, nec scribere volui, nec ab aliquo meorum scriptas novi. Falsae sunt, et eis ad delusionem vestram, et sui damnationem, solus falsarius scienter usus est.*

His *Polycraticus*, *Metalogicus*, and other works, may be found in Migne's *Patrologie*, Vol. cxcix.—*Trans*

what he had said in the preface, regarding the occupations with which he was overwhelmed.

Have we had enough of inconsistencies and fooleries? Was Salisbury capable of putting his signature to things so silly? We must also make account of differences in style, which literary connoisseurs have remarked between Chapter XLII. of the *Metologicus* and the undoubted writings of the prelate.

CHAPTER XVII.

DISAGREEMENT BETWEEN THE PSEUDO-METALOGICUS AND THE FALSE BULL OF ADRIAN IV.

I TRANSCRIBE Chapter XLII., or rather, I translate it. The Latin text is sufficiently known. I shall add my observations.

"I conclude. At this moment it would be more proper to weep than to write ; and I learn by sensible experience that the whole world is subject to vanity. We have hoped for peace, and lo ! trouble and tempest burst on Toulouse, and everywhere rouse the English and the French ; and Kings, whom we have seen united, pursue each other without a moment's intermission. Moreover, the death of the Lord Pope Adrian, which has alarmed all the peoples of Christendom, has caused still greater grief in our England, of which he was a native, and evoked more abundant tears. Good people deplore this loss, but no one should lament it more than I. In fact, although he had his mother and a uterine brother, he loved me more than them. He declared, in public as well as in private, that he had a greater affection for me than for any other person in the world. He had formed such an opinion of me that he was delighted to open his heart and conscience to me, as often as opportunity offered. Though Roman Pontiff, he was pleased to have me as guest at his table ; in spite of my reluctance, he required that one plate and one cup should be in common between us. At my request he gave Ireland to the illustrious King of England, Henry II., to be possessed by hereditary right, as his letters prove to this day. For all

islands, in virtue of a very ancient law, are considered to belong to the Roman Church, through a donation of Constantine, who founded and endowed this Church. Moreover, Pope Adrian sent by me a gold ring, adorned with a most beautiful emerald, by which investiture with the right of governing Ireland should be made ; and this ring is preserved by order in the public archives of the Court. I should never be done if I were to relate all the virtues of this illustrious Pontiff. But that which pierces all hearts most is the schism, which, in punishment of our sins, afflicts the Church, so great a Pontiff having been taken away, . . . Independently of the public sorrow, I feel an inward sorrow which is no less. For my father and lord, who is also yours, the venerable Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, has fallen sick, and what will be the course of the illness is uncertain. No longer able to attend to affairs, he has laid on me a hard duty and an insupportable burden, the care of all the ecclesiastics. My spirit everywhere finds pain, and the tortures that I endure I am unable to express. The only recourse left for me is to pray to the Man-God, the Son of the Immaculate Virgin."

This strange passage claims some serious remarks. I shall divide them into several points, so as to give more clearness to the subject.

First Observation. The part that mentions the siege of Toulouse imitates a part in the preface of the *Polycraticus*. If John of Salisbury, about this period, entered the service of Becket, could he be at the same time chancellor and secretary to Theobald?

Second Observation. In the preface of the *Metalogicus*, Salisbury speaks of the duties that he fulfils in regard to the ecclesiastical causes of all England, by order of his lord ; but he does not name the Archbishop, he does not say that he speaks of Theobald. Here, in short, is the passage from the prologue :—"Placuit itaque sociis, ut hoc ipsum tumultuario modo dictarem : cum nec ad sententias subtiliter examinandas, nec ad verba expolienda, studium superesset, aut otium. Necessariis enim occupationibus vix aliquid amplius deducebatur quam refectionis hora, vel somni : cum ex mandato Domini mei, cui deesse non possum, sollicitudo totius Britanniae, quod ad causas ecclesiasticas, mihi incumbat. Ad hæc sollicitudo rei familiaris, et curiales nugæ, studium excludebant : amico-

rum interpellatio me fere totum absorbuerat. . . . Et quia logici suscepi patrociniū, *Metalogicon* descriptus est liber."

All this agrees very well with the first days of Saint Thomas, before the conflict with Henry II. Accordingly, the *Metalogicus* would have been written about that period.

I do not see any motive that could have induced the author to repeat in Chapter XLII. what he had said in the preface, namely, that he was absorbed in his duties, overwhelmed with the cares entrusted to him. Besides, what is clear in the *Prologus* becomes ambiguous in Chapter XLII. The preface says : *Sollicitudo totius Britannię, quod ad causas ecclesiasticas*. This is the exercise of metropolitan or primatial jurisdiction. In Chapter XLII., on the contrary, there is no longer any question of the affairs of England ; there is mention only of ecclesiastics, which seems confined to persons: *Omnium ecclesiasticorum sollicitudo*. We should say that it was a mere glance over the moral conduct of the clergy.

What is truly new in Chapter XLII. is the name of Theobald, which is not in the Preface.

As it is very doubtful whether Salisbury was ever in the service of Theobald, this circumstance increases suspicion against Chapter XLII.

Third Observation. What the writer relates of the familiarity with which Pope Adrian treated him is truly unworthy of the pontifical majesty. Salisbury expressed himself more modestly in the *Polycraticus* :—" I remember that I set out for Apulia, to visit the Lord Pope Adrian, who had admitted me to a special familiarity. I remained with him at Beneventum for nearly three months. While we were often speaking of different matters, as is usual among friends, and he questioned me familiarly and diligently, to know what men thought of him and of the Roman Church, I took the liberty of openly representing to him what I had learned in various provinces." (*Poly.*, l. 6, c. 24.)

Salisbury does not here wander from the respect constantly due to the Sovereign Pontiff. But it is quite a different case in Chapter XLII.

Who will believe that Pope Adrian took pleasure in saying publicly that he loved Salisbury more than any

other person in the world—more than his own mother or his own brother?

It is known that the Pope eats alone. The Roman ceremonials of the twelfth century mark the days on which the Cardinals are invited to the Pontifical table. It would be a strange thing that Salisbury should have been a continual guest with the Pope for nearly three months ; but that the Pope should absolutely have wished to eat from the same plate and to drink from the same cup as his pretended friend—this is an enormity which ought to appear sufficient for the rejection of the whole passage as apocryphal. Nothing would remain to be added but that Salisbury was a sharer of the Pope's bed.

It is most extraordinary that the forger did not see that these monstrous exaggerations would take away all credit from what he was soon going to say about Ireland.

Fourth Observation. If it is true that Pope Adrian IV. gave Ireland to the King of England at the request of Salisbury (*ad preces meas*), this naturally means that the King did not ask this gift, which was spontaneous on the part of the Pontiff. Now this circumstance is contradicted by the Apocryphal Bull, which mentions a letter from the King. In any case, it is very strange that the donation of a kingdom should have been obtained by a private individual, who had no official character. The false Salisbury of Chapter XLII. does not give the least hint in the world that Henry II. had charged him with the mission of soliciting, in his name, authority to invade the land of Ireland, and to compel the inhabitants to recognise him as their lord and master. On the other hand, the Apocryphal Bull does not name Salisbury ; it mentions no ambassador who has made a petition in the name of the King. One might believe that the affair had all been arranged by correspondence.

Fifth Observation. Salisbury, in the *Polycraticus*, fixes the time of his interview with Adrian IV., when saying that he met him at Beneventum. Adrian IV. sojourned at Beneventum for seven months, from November 21, 1155, to July 10, 1156. If the concession in regard to Ireland was made during the three months that Salisbury spent at Beneventum, how explain the silence that he kept about it in the *Polyeraticus*, published three years afterwards,

in 1159? On the other hand, if the donation of Ireland is to be referred to another journey of Salisbury's, the author of Chapter XLII. ought so much the more justly to have fixed its time, as the Apocryphal Bull is without date in Giraldus Cambrensis, who, it seems, was the first to publish this Bull. Other historians and compilers have put : *Datum Romæ*, etc. According to this, the Bull could not be referred to the sojourn of Adrian at Beneventum, nor to the journey that the *Polycraticus* makes known.

Sixth Observation. The author of Chapter XLII. announces a letter of Pope Adrian IV. regarding Ireland ; but he did not know its tenor, he never had it before his eyes. If he had known it, he would not have asserted that the Pope gave Ireland to the King of England and his successors by right of succession and inheritance : *Ad preces meas illustri Anglorum regi Henrico secundo concessit et dedit Hiberniam jure hereditario possidendam, sicut literæ ipsius testantur in hodiernum diem.* What a misfortune that the writer did not describe more definitely this *dies hodiernus* ! In the Apocryphal Bull, on the contrary, there is no question of investiture, and still less of a perpetual investiture, that passes to heirs and successors, without there being need to have it renewed and confirmed at the beginning of each new reign. In fact, the Bull simply announces a personal concession for King Henry II., that he may engage in reforming morals and repressing vices. It is only for the accomplishment of this temporary mission, exclusively religious and moral, that the Pope permits the King to be received honourably by the people of Ireland, and to be revered as their lord.

"We therefore" (this is what the Apocryphal Bull says), "receiving with due favor your pious and laudable desires, and graciously granting our consent to your petition, declare that it is pleasing and acceptable to us, that for the purpose of enlarging the limits of the Church, settling bounds to the torrent of vice, reforming evil manners, planting the seeds of virtue, and increasing Christian faith, you should enter that island and carry into effect those things which belong to the service of God and to the salvation of that people ; and that the people of that land should honourably receive and reverence you as

their lord."¹ All this is essentially different from feudal investiture.

Seventh Observation. The sending of a ring as a sign of investiture is a thing unexampled in history, if the Pope does not at the same time appoint a delegate to perform publicly the ceremony of the imposition of the ring. The pseudo-Salisbury tells us gravely that Pope Adrian sent a gold ring, in order to proceed to the investiture : *Annulum quoque per me transmisit aureum, smaragdo optimo decoratum, quo fieret investitura juris in gerenda² Hibernia, idemque annulus in curiali archivo publico custodiri jussus est.* I look for the Pontifical delegate. It certainly was not Salisbury, a simple priest.

The Apocryphal Bull itself does not speak of a ring or of investiture. I find no trace of this ring except in Giraldus Cambrensis, whom I have quoted above.

Eighth Observation. Hereditary investiture is without example in the Pontifical *diplomatique* of the twelfth century. The Pope, granting that investiture should pass to heirs and successors, required a renovation and confirmation of it at each change of reign or pontificate. The Normans of Naples and Sicily submitted to the common law : their diplomas are met everywhere in the annals of Baronius and other historians. According to the pseudo-Salisbury, Adrian IV., treating the Normans of England much more favourably, would have granted perpetual investiture by the magic virtue of a ring kept in the royal archives of Winchester !

Ninth Observation. Salisbury was too enlightened to say that the Emperor Constantine *founded* the Roman Church ; for foundation goes back to Jesus Christ, or to the times of the Apostles. It is not even quite true that this Emperor *endowed* the Roman Church : in the very era of the persecutions, it owned property, which, confiscated under Diocletian, was restored by order of Constantine.

If John of Salisbury really wrote in 1160 that all islands belong to the Holy See, he did not perceive that this

¹ To preserve uniformity of translation, the words of this sentence are borrowed from the translation given by Cardinal Moran, No. 1 among the Documents at the end.—*Trans.*

² *Regenda*?

maxim would apply directly to England. We shall meet again with this inconsistency in the Apocryphal Bull.¹

CHAPTER XVIII.

EXAMINATION OF THE APOCRYPHAL BULL.

Was Henry II. incapable of forging a Bull? Would he have shrunk back with horror at a crime of falsehood?

He feared excommunication very much, it is true. His flight into Ireland in 1171 showed the terror with which the thunders of the Church had filled him. But in his time, the Bull *In cœna Domini* not yet existing, the falsifiers of acts of the Holy See did not incur excommunication by the very fact.

Under a deceitful exterior, Henry concealed a heart capable of descending to the vilest artifices, and of sporting with his own honour and veracity. No one could believe his assertions or trust his promises. He justified his habits of duplicity by the maxim that "it is better to repent of words than of facts, to be guilty of falsehood than to fail in a favourite pursuit." (*Lingard.*)

Giraldus Cambrensis, on the subject of the King's duplicity, says ;—"Naturali quadam inconstantia, verbi spontaneus plerumque transgressor. Nam quoties in arctum res devenerat, de dicto malens quam facto pœni-

¹ It is likely that John of Salisbury was one of the greatest letter-writers of his day. Although more than 320 of his letters are preserved in the Migne collection, they are said to be only a few. The Rev. W. B. Morris, of the Oratory, London, thinking that if Salisbury had really obtained a grant of Ireland for Henry II., as related in Chapter XLII. of the *Metalogicus*, he must have alluded to it in some of these letters, examined them all. He found twenty-seven letters addressed to Pope Adrian IV., eleven to King Henry II., and twenty-three to Pope Alexander III.—but in none of them a single word about a donation of Ireland, or anything bearing on such a subject. Is it not therefore morally certain that Salisbury is not the author of Chapter XLII? Again, as Cardinal Moran remarks, Salisbury, after the death of Adrian IV., having fallen into disgrace at Henry's court, wrote many letters setting forth his merits, and defending himself against the displeasure of the King, but in none of them did he refer to a signal service that he had rendered in obtaining a grant of Ireland. Is it not thus evident that he had never rendered any such service, and that Chapter XLII. is a mere forgery?—*Trans.*

tere, verbumque facilius quam factum irritum habere." (Vol. v., p. 304.)

Cardinal Vivian, after a long conversation with the King, remarked that he had never seen a man tell lies with such a brazen face. (*Epist. S. Thom.*, 3, 6.)

His anger was that of a madman ; his fury, that of a wild beast. Est leo, aut leone truculentior, dum vehementius excandescit. (Peter of Blois, *Epist.* 66, 75.)

A page having presented a letter to him, the King tried to pull out his eyes, and it was only with wounds that the youth escaped. (*Epist. S. Thom.*, 1, 45.)

Pride and anger, cunning and duplicity, were the chief traits in his character.

The falsity of the letter attributed to Pope Adrian has already been proved by extrinsic arguments, set forth at length in the preceding chapters. A document that is produced only thirty years or so after the date given it, while one had the greatest interest in using it if it existed, necessarily falls to the ground by a presumption so overwhelming against it. It is time to examine the Apocryphal Bull in itself—in its intrinsic characteristics.¹

SECTION 1.

Above all I remark that the document, such as Giraldus Cambrensis gives it and most chroniclers repeat it, does not express the name of the prince to whom it is addressed: *Adrianus episcopus, servus servorum Dei, carissimo in Christo filio illustri Anglorum regi, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.*

I search in vain for the initial H. at the very least.² Ought we to suppose that the forger took care not to mention the name because he could not foresee the time when somebody would be in a position to utilise the Bull?

SECTION 2.

The preamble is copied almost word for word from the true letter of Adrian IV., that which he wrote to Louis VII., King of France, in 1159, in order to point

¹ For a full translation of the apocryphal Bull, see Document No. 1 at the end of the book.—*Trans.*

² To denote Henry.—*Trans.*

out to him the injustice and the danger of an expedition to Ireland. A comparison of the two preambles suffices to demonstrate the falsity of the Bull. It happens more than once that Pontifical Letters begin with three or four words identically the same, as in other diplomas, especially if they are of different years ; but that ten or fifteen lines, substantially the same, should appear in two distinct letters—I do not think that an example of it can be found in the whole Roman Bullarium.

The true letter of Adrian IV. begins thus:—*Satis laudabiliter et fructuose de christiano nomine propagando in terris, et æternæ beatitudinis præmio tibi cumulando in cœlis, tua videtur magnificentia cogitare, dum ad dilatandos terminos populi christiani, ad paganorum barbariem debellandam, et ad gentes apostatrices, et quæ Catholicæ fidei refugiant nec recipiunt veritatem, christianorum jugo et ditioni subdendas, simul cum charissimo filio nostro Henrico illustri Anglorum rege, in H. properare intendis, et stades assidue (ut opus hoc felicem exitum sortiatur) exercitum et quæ sunt itineri necessaria congregare. Atque ad id convenientius exsequendum, matris tuæ sacrosanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ consilium exigis et favorem. Quod quidem propositum tanto magis gratum acceptumque teneamus, et amplius sicut commendandum est, commendamus, quanto de sinceriore charitatis radice talem intentionem et votum tam laudabile processum credimus, ac de majori ardore fidei et religionis amore propositum et desiderium tuum principium habuerunt.*

The apocryphal bull begins thus:—*Laudabiliter satis et fructuose de glorioso nomine propagando in terris, et æternæ felicitatis præmio cumulando in cœlis, tua magnificentia cogitat; dum ad dilatandos Ecclesiæ terminos, ad declarandam inductis et rudibus populis christianæ fidei veritatem, et vitiorum plantaria de agro Dominico extirpanda, sicut catholicus princeps intendis; et ad id convenientius exsequendum consilium Apostolicæ sedis exigis, et favorem. In quo facto, quanto altiori consilio et majori discretionem procedis, tanto in eo feliciter progressum te, præstante Domino, confidimus habiturum; eo quod ad bonum exitum semper et finem solent attingere quæ de ardore fidei et religionis amore principium acceperunt . . . Significasti siquidem nobis, fili in Christo carissime, te Hiberniæ insulam, ad subdendum illum populum legibus,¹ et vitiorum plantaria inde extirpanda, velle intrare . . . Nos itaque, pium et laudabile desiderium tuum cum favore congruo prosequentes, et petitioni bonæ benignum impendentes assensum, gratum et acceptum habemus, ut pro dilatandis Ecclesiæ terminis, pro vitiorum restringendo decursu, pro corrigendis moribus, et virtutibus inserendis, pro christianæ religionis augmento, insulam illam ingrediaris.*

¹ Addend. forsan *tuis* vel *christianis*.

The counterfeiting is so close that it is amazing how it has not awakened the suspicions of historians. It might be said that not one of them had gone to the trouble of comparing the two documents, or of reading them over with attention. Other passages imitated from the true letter may be seen in the Apocryphal Bull.

The true letter says : *In H. PROPERARE intendis.* On the contrary, we read in the Apocryphal Bull : *Significasti nobis te Hiberniæ insulam . . . velle INTRARE . . . Gratum habemus ut . . . insulam illam INGREDIARIS.* These expressions seem to mean that there is question of penetrating into the interior of Ireland, and suppose that the King of England occupies a few points along the coast. It was only a dozen years after the death of Pope Adrian that the adventurers and the King took Dublin and Waterford. It is therefore impossible that the Bull should be from Pope Adrian.

It is said in the true letter that Louis VII. was preparing an army, and such things as were necessary for the voyage : *Studes assidue . . . exercitum, et quæ sunt itineri necessaria, congregare.* An expedition on the continent requires little more than a good army. This goes to prove that the expedition on which Louis VII. and Henry II. consulted Pope Adrian related to Ireland, and not to Spain, as I have shown (in Chapters VI. and VII.).

How surprising that Pope Adrian should raise no objection against the conquest of Ireland—he who, in his letter to Louis VII., weighed with so much wisdom and circumspection the difficulties of the enterprise, and the injustice of an intervention that was not asked for by the Church, the princes, or the people of the land !

SECTION 3.

The forger makes Pope Adrian IV. say that Ireland, and in general all islands enlightened by Christ, the Sun of Justice, that is to say, those which have received the teachings of Faith, belong to the Apostle Saint Peter and to the Roman Church : *Sane Hiberniam, et omnes insulas, quibus sol justitiæ Christus illuxit, et quæ documenta fidei christianæ ceperunt, ad jus beati Petri et sacrosanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, quod tua etiam nobilitas*

recognoscit, non est dubium pertinere. Thus, the King of England, writing to the Pope in order to ask Ireland, would have admitted that all islands belong to the Holy See.

1. The power of Constantine, from a political point of view, was the same in pagan islands as in those which had embraced Christianity. I see no reason for limiting the concession to Christian countries. Had Ireland received Christianity at the beginning of the fourth century?

2. At the most, Constantine could only have given islands dependent on the empire. Now, the Romans, far from conquering Ireland, always left it outside their frontiers. Constantine could not be unaware of this fact—he who spent a great part of his life in insular Great Britain.

3. The Popes did not avail themselves of a donation from Constantine for Rome, nor for the Italian continent, nor even for islands. Consult the letters of *Codex Carolinus*, whose authenticity cannot be doubted; examine the register of St. Gregory the Great; study the imperial diplomas from the ninth to the fifteenth century: you will always see that, if Constantine gave some territorial possessions or *patrimones*, political authority had an origin quite different, which was nothing but the piety of Pepin, Charlemagne, and other emperors, who established the Pontifical Sovereignty. Now, these solemn, authentic, and official diplomas never make any allusion to a donation of Constantine.

4. Among the notes that Mr. O'Callaghan has added to the *Macariæ Excidium*, I remark one (p. 246) relating to the donation of Constantine, and in it I find, to my great regret, some unjustifiable prepossessions, which cannot be reconciled with the truth of history. He speaks thus:

“Upon the famous apocryphal donation of Constantine, on which the request of Henry the Second's envoy for a grant of Ireland from Adrian IV. was based, Gibbon, who assigns the date of that fabrication to the latter end of the eighth century, says:—‘This memorable donation was introduced to the world by an epistle of Adrian the First, who exhorts Charlemagne to imitate the liberality and revive the name of the great Constantine. According to the legend, the first of the Christian emperors, . . . healed of the leprosy . . . by St. Sylvester, . . . declared

his resolution of founding a new capital in the East, and resigned to the Popes the free and perpetual sovereignty of Rome, Italy, and the provinces of the West. . . . So deep was the ignorance and credulity of the times, that the most absurd of fables was received, with equal reverence, in Greece and France, and is still enrolled among the decrees of the canon law. In the revival of letters and liberty, this fictitious deed was transpierced by the pen of Laurentius Valla, the pen of an eloquent critic, and a Roman patriot. His contemporaries of the fifteenth century were astonished at his sacrilegious boldness ; yet such is the silent and irresistible progress of reason that . . . the fable was rejected by the contempt of historians and poets."

I am going to show that these assertions contain as many errors as words.

(a) Gibbon is mistaken. The supposition of a grant from Constantine reaches back much farther than the eighth century ; but it is right to add that the Popes did not avail themselves of it. Did St. Gregory the Great pretend to be the sovereign of Rome or of Italy? When Belisarius and Narses reconquered the peninsula from the Goths, I do not see that the Popes of the time cried out in the name of Constantine's donation. On the contrary, the imperial exarchs, during several centuries, governed, in the name of the emperor, not only Rome and Ravenna, but even the islands.

(b) If Pope Adrian I. advised Charlemagne to imitate the generosity of Constantine, he referred to territorial possessions, to fruitful domains, and not to political sovereignty, which this emperor never conferred on the Holy See. For the rest, what more could Adrian I. ask of Charlemagne, who had already, with his father, Pepin, either bestowed on the Holy See or restored to it the exarchate of Ravenna, from Spezia and Plaisance as far as Rimini and Ancona, and then Rome and its provinces ; besides a great part of central and southern Italy, and many islands lying near Italy, Corsica among the number? Could the Popes have desired more?

(c) It matters little if some writers are mistaken about a grant of Constantine—believing it to be authentic and true. The essential point is that the Popes did not avail

themselves of this apocryphal title-deed. In point of fact, they derived their political sovereignty from the restitutions, donations, and confirmations of Pepin, Charlemagne, and their successors. St. Gregory VII. never made use of the donation of Constantine, although St. Peter Damian employs it in his arguments against the Teutons, followers of the anti-Pope Cadolaus. The donation was also cited in a letter of Leo IX. to Michael Cerularius. (*Patrologie*, tome 143, p. 752.)

(d) O'Callaghan insists on a pretended diploma of Pope Urban II., grounded on a donation of Constantine, to dispose of Corsica in favour of the Pisans. "This nonsense," says the writer, "of the Pope's being the head owner of all Christian islands had been partially announced to the world in a Bull of Urban II., dated A.D. 1091, in which, on disposing of the island of Corsica, he said that the Emperor Constantine had given the islands to St. Peter and his vicars." (See Fleury, lib. 64, sec. 8.)

I answer that the diploma attributed to Urban II. is apocryphal. It is not in the Roman Bullarium.

Urban II. could not be unaware that Corsica was included in the donation of Charlemagne, and that the confirmatory diplomas of all the emperors expressly designated it as belonging to the Holy See: what need then of relying on a title so uncertain as a donation of Constantine?

In reality, the Roman archives possessed from that time, and preserve to this day, those imperial diplomas of the ninth and tenth centuries which attest the donation of Corsica by Kings Pepin and Charlemagne—notably Manuscript 1964 of the Vatican. The celebrated diploma in gold letters, on an azure ground, of the Emperor Otho, A.D. 962, kept in the same archives, mentions Corsica among the pontifical dominions. Likewise, a diploma of the Emperor Henry II. in the year 1014.

Scarcely fifteen years before Urban II., Pope Gregory VII., preparing for a crusade, had the strong castles of Corsica surrendered to him, and appointed a governor of the island, as representative of the Roman Church.

Could Urban II. be unaware of these public and recent

facts? Moreover, prudence forbade the substitution of feudal investiture for an immediate governor, at a time when the strategic position of Corsica was of supreme importance for the security of the "grand army" of the Crusaders, and for the freedom of maritime communications with the East. Urban II. consequently took care not to partially alienate Corsica, by yielding it to investiture. It is a real mockery to place a donation of Constantine on the lips or on the pen of the Pope in such circumstances. Therefore, the diploma of 1091 is apocryphal. It has been known only to the annalists of Pisa, interested in making us believe that the Pope gave to their people the investiture of Corsica. So say Dal Borgo¹ and Tronci.² Such are the sources of the diploma!

(e) O'Callaghan objects, with Gibbon, that the false donation of Constantine was inserted in the canonical collection: "Is still enrolled among the decrees of the canon law." Now the famous donation is found, certainly not in official codes or in pontifical decretals, but only in the compilation of the monk Gratian, which is a work in all respects private, which the Popes have always taken care not to authorise or to authenticate, and whose contents have no other value than what they carry *per se*.³ Every student of theology knows this. It is surprising that men so studious as Gibbon and O'Callaghan should be ignorant of a fact so elementary.

(f) Considering that the Popes abstained from making use of a donation of Constantine, and that the example of Urban II., the only one adduced to the contrary, is forged and false, it is not possible that Pope Adrian IV. took, as the foundation of a grant of Ireland to the King of England, the said donation of Constantine. It follows that the Bull *Laudabiliter satis*, attributed to Pope Adrian IV., is apocryphal.

¹ *Raccolta di diplomi Pisani*, p. 31.

² *Memorie di Pisa*, p. 31.

³ Gratian was a Benedictine monk at Bologna in the twelfth century. His work was not simply a collection of canons, but a treatise on canon law. In spite of his good intentions, it contained many mistakes.—*Trans.*

SECTION 4.

After the oath of Avranches, which recognised the feudal sovereignty of the Pope over the kingdom of England, Henry II. could naturally say that islands belonged to the Holy See. But in the case of the Apocryphal Bull, which, as is pretended, was written seventeen years previously, the King could not without inconvenience acknowledge the right of the Pope over islands, because he would thereby have engaged and compromised the independence of the kingdom of England itself. Hence, it follows, that the Apocryphal Bull was drawn up after the oath of Avranches, which was taken in 1172—consequently a long time after Adrian IV., who died in 1159. This is another argument against the genuineness of the Bull.

O'Callaghan quotes approvingly a conjecture from Dr. Lanigan, who thinks that Pope Adrian hinted to the King that the kingdom of England, being in an island, belonged to the Holy See, like other islands.

"The Doctor cites and criticises the following passage in the Bull :—*Sane Hiberniam et omnes insulas quibus sol justitiæ illuxit, et quæ documenta fidei Christianæ ceperunt, ad jus beati Petri et sacrosantæ Romanæ ecclesiæ (quod tua etiam nobilitas recognoscit) non est dubium pertinere.*" By the words in the parenthesis, remarks the Doctor, the Pope probably meant to hint to Henry that also his kingdom of England, as being in an island, belonged to the Holy See ; and we find that, in the year 1173, Henry declared himself a vassal of Pope Alexander III.

But since the King recognised in his letter (which nobody has ever seen) the right of the Pope over all islands, what need had Pope Adrian to suggest this maxim to a prince who was the first to formulate it? On the other hand, if the Pope intended an allusion to England, we must admit that he expressed himself in a manner not to be understood. In fact, Henry allowed seventeen years to roll by before acquitting himself in regard to feudal subjection.

It is natural to suppose that the King put the maxim into the Apocryphal Bull, with a view to availing himself of it against Ireland, and perhaps against Scotland, the

Isle of Man, and other islands that he coveted. At the time of the fabrication of the Bull, Henry had nothing to fear for England, seeing the engagements that he had taken by the oath of Avranches.

SECTION 5.

The forger tells us that the King promised to establish Peter's Pence through all Ireland : *Significasti nobis . . . te Hiberniæ insulam . . . velle intrare ; et de singulis domibus annuam unius denarii beato Petro velle solvere pensionem.* Adrian IV., on his side, authorises the King to penetrate into the country, and orders the people to welcome him with respect, on condition that the rights of the churches will be safeguarded, and that Peter's Penny will be paid annually from every house : *Salva beato Petro, et sacrosanctæ Romanæ ecclesiæ, de singulis domibus annua unius denarii pensione.* So we read in the Apocryphal Bull.

1. If all this is true, the Pope and the King made an unworthy bargain. Henry bought Ireland, and Adrian IV., to gain a pecuniary pension, sacrificed the independence of a nation.

2. Diplomas of investiture usually prescribed an annual payment, in recognition of sovereign dominion ; but this payment was exceedingly small, one or two crowns a year. Here, on the contrary, Pope Adrian required an enormous contribution ; for the Anglo-Norman penny was worth four or five shillings of our present money.¹ Thanks to these data, we can approximately calculate the annual income. It would have amounted to a sum truly unexampled in the history of pontifical investitures.

3. The Kings of Naples paid a pretty high tribute, because it included the revenues of some ancient patri-

¹ That is, a penny in former times would purchase as much as three or four shillings in our day.

England has often used debased coin in Ireland, by which the people suffered heavy loss. This method of cheating is much the same as to take good silver from a man and give him its weight in pewter.

It is not very long since two values were given to money in these islands. Thus up to 1825 the English shilling passed in Ireland for thirteen pence, and the English guinea for £1 2s. 6d.—*Trans.*

monies which Constantine gave to the Roman Church, and which were wasted by the Saracens.

4. In England, the Peter's Pence came from ancient usage, from the spontaneous offering that princes and people had formerly made of the tribute.

5. Peter's Pence were not established in Ireland : no Pope claimed them. The clause of the Apocryphal Bull is therefore false and forged. Giraldus Cambrensis, who believed *bona fide* in the genuineness of the Bull, attributed the misfortunes of the English Kings in Ireland to the violation of their promise regarding Peter's Pence, as I shall say further on.

6. Henry II. really possessed some towns along the Irish coast, and his barons subjected some adjacent counties. How is it that he did not establish Peter's Pence at least in these towns and counties? In the treaty of Windsor, of which I have spoken above, supposing the fact to be authentic, Henry II., required of the King of Connaught to promise an annual tribute of one cowhide or sheepskin on every ten beasts ; but there was not a word of Peter's Pence promised to Pope Adrian.

7. Henry II. had the clause inserted in the Apocryphal Bull, probably to furnish a pretext for penetrating into Ireland, and exacting tributes for himself, not for the Pope.¹ Innocent III. claimed Peter's Pence from the English bishops ; but, I repeat it, no Pope ever asked Peter's Pence from the Irish bishops, or from the Irish people.

SECTION 6.

St. Stephen of Hungary received from Rome a kind of apostolic legateship for the propagation and advancement of religion in his kingdom, as we see in the Roman Breviary, at the date September 2nd : *Vere propter ingens dilatandæ fidei studium, illius gentis Apostolus nuncupatus, facta a Romano Pontifice ipsi posterisque regibus præferendæ crucis potestate.* It is an analogous mission

¹ The flaunting of Peter's Pence would seem to have been a kind of hypocritical bribe, employed to gain credence for the Bull. Neither Henry nor his successors ever established Peter's Pence in Ireland.—*Trans.*

that the false Bull attributes to Henry II. ; but this kind of moral delegation has no connection with political investiture. Having treated of this point in a previous chapter, when I examined an addition to the *Metalogicus*, I need not return to it.

Henry II. simply wished to penetrate into Ireland, and to see himself welcomed there without distrust. As for the rest, he took it on himself, hoping very much that once he had entered the sheep-fold, he would never come out again.

This is the reason why the Apocryphal Bull allows an entrance into Ireland, and recommends the people to receive the King with respectful and submissive behaviour. This mission is purely personal : it does not extend to the successors of the King of England.

The most surprising thing of all is that the Bishops of Ireland are never mentioned in the false Bull. For the King alone the pre-eminently religious mission of propagating the faith, repressing vices, and planting virtues ! We might suppose that Ireland at the time had not one Bishop, or one clergyman !

The pseudo-Adrian concludes by giving the King full power to regulate by himself, or by his agents, whatever is of a nature to procure the glory of God, an increase of faith, and the salvation of souls. What other secular prince has ever received ecclesiastical jurisdiction in a manner so complete ?

“ Let it be your study to form that people to good morals, and take such orders both by yourself and by those whom you shall find qualified in faith, in words, and in conduct, that the Church there may be adorned, and the practices of the Christian faith be planted and increased ; and let all that tends to the glory of God and the salvation of souls be so ordered by you that you may deserve to obtain from God an increase of everlasting reward, and may secure on earth a glorious name throughout all time.”

If Henry had succeeded in causing his false Bull to be accepted, he would have recovered in Ireland that supremacy which the labours and the martyrdom of Saint Thomas of Canterbury had compelled him to abandon in England.

SECTION 7.

The forger contented himself with writing an ordinary letter in the name of Pope Adrian IV. He did not go to the trouble of fabricating a solemn diploma, a Bull properly so called, with the formalities employed by the Roman Chancery. Yet the transaction deserved a Bull. Adrian answered Louis VII. with an ordinary letter, because he granted nothing, and was satisfied to point out the dangers of an Irish expedition ; but the case is very different for an act of the kind here considered.

The Bulls of the grant of investiture¹ were consistorial acts, which should be furnished with the signatures of cardinals. The forger, fearing perhaps that some one of the signatories might still be in the world and raise a protest, judged it prudent to name no other person than Pope Adrian, who had died about thirty years before.²

What must be my conclusion? I shall not formulate it. I prefer to leave it to the judgment of the reader.

¹ The following will show the manner in which the Pope and Cardinals usually added their names to documents. It is taken from Pope Adrian's letter No. 98.

Ego Adrianus catholicæ Ecclesiæ episcopus.

Ego Guido presb. card. tit. Sancti Chrysogoni.

Ego Julius presb. card. tit. Sancti Marcelli.

Ego Octavianus presb. card. tit. S. Cecilie.

Ego Gerardus presb. card. tit. S. Stephani in Cœlio Monte.

Datum Beneventi per manum Rolandi, sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ presbyteri cardinalis et cancellarii, Kal. Junii, indict. IV., Incarnationis Dominicæ anno 1156, pontificatus vero domni Adriani papæ IV. anno secundo.

The Cardinal Roland here mentioned as Chancellor became Pope Alexander III. in 1159, after the death of Adrian IV., and reigned till 1181. He had doubtless learned from Pope Adrian what to think of Henry II.—*Trans.*

² In Migne's collection there are 258 letters (including bulls, privileges, &c.) attributed to Pope Adrian IV., and all appear to be genuine except No. 76 *Laudabiliter satis*. Generally found without any clear mention, at the beginning, of the person to whom it is addressed, or, at the end, of the place or the date at which it was written, it is said to be "without head or tail." If we had no other evidence in regard to the qualifications of Pope Adrian IV., any one, examining this collection, will readily see that he was a man of real merit, great wisdom, and calm moderation—not at all likely to

CHAPTER XIX.

DIPLOMA ATTRIBUTED TO ALEXANDER II.

GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS, who, it seems, was the first to publish the diploma of Pope Alexander, in *Hibernia Expugnata*, disclaimed it afterwards in another work that he published towards the close of his life, entitled *De Instructione Principis*. Some assure us, he says, or pretend to believe, that the diploma was obtained; but others deny that it was ever obtained. *Sicut a quibusdam impetratum asseritur: ab aliis autem unquam impetratum fuisse negatur*. There is no chance of making capital out of this document.¹

Like the Apocryphal Bull, this diploma is without date; neither does it express the name of the King to whom it is addressed. O'Callaghan has not failed to publish it, observing, with Dr. Lanigan, that "the attempts to dis-

guilty of injustice. The conviction will grow on the reader's mind that Adrian, being a native of England, knew better than others what to think of the Plantagenets, and that probably he never even once in his life wrote to Henry.—*Trans*.

¹ Migne gives over 1,500 letters attributed to Pope Alexander III. He then adds two under the heading "Spuria." One of these is addressed to Henry II., and is specially interesting as giving him authority over the Bishops of England: "Insuper, fili charissime, si episcopi tui regni in nostro mandato apostolica et archiepiscopatu nimis negligentes, quod absit! extiterint, volumus quod manus adjutrices extendas ad sustentandam Romanæ Ecclesiæ libertatem; et sic obtinebis apostolicam benedictionem; quia post sententiam latam si incorrigibiles perstiterint, sacrosancta Ecclesia non potest ultra facere nisi invocare brachium seculare." Henry II. in his desire to be Head of the Church, and in several other respects, bore a great resemblance to Henry VIII. Both had a furious hatred for St. Thomas of Canterbury. Henry VIII. summoned the dead Archbishop before the royal tribunal on a charge of high treason. The writ was hung up at his tomb. As the holy man did not appear on the day of trial, sentence was passed against him. His name was blotted out of the calendar of the saints, the memory of him totally condemned, his bones burned, his ashes thrown into the river, and all the precious ornaments—gold, silver, jewels, &c.—of his shrine, said to have been the richest in Europe, were carried away to the royal coffers.—*Trans*.

prove the authenticity of Alexander's, as well as Adrian's Bull, have been equally unsuccessful."

I turn to the document in the recent edition of the works of Gilraldus Cambrensis. (Vol. v., p. 318.)

It is unnecessary to discuss at any great length the value of a diploma that, as I have said above, has been disclaimed by the very man who was most deeply interested in maintaining it.

1. How strange that Alexander III., who knew nothing of Adrian's Bull when he wrote the three letters of which I have spoken above (Chapter XIII.), now comes forward to confirm a donation of Ireland to the King of England, without naming this prince.

2. One might say that Pope Alexander confirmed Adrian's Bull, without ever having seen it. As a matter of fact, the pretended authority given by Adrian to enter Ireland, and the recommendation to welcome him as lord, are transformed by Alexander into a grant of the dominion of the Irish kingdom: *Concessionem ejusdem super Hibernici regni dominio vobis indulto . . . ratam habemus et confirmamus*. Was Ireland a kingdom, or did it bear this title in any public acts? The plural *vobis* takes us by surprise: the forger would have us believe that Ireland was given to all the Kings of England in perpetuity.

3. The mention of Peter's Pence shows beyond question the falsity of the diploma, as I have established in the preceding chapter. It is inadmissible that Popes Adrian and Alexander should have authorised or accepted a tribute which was never paid, and which the Holy See never asked.

4. Although Lanigan believed in the genuineness of the diploma, he exclaims against the charge of barbarism and infamous morals with which the Pontiff is supposed to reproach the people of Ireland. The Pope, he says, "seems to have known nothing of the state of the Irish Church, except what he heard from the lying accounts of the enemies of Ireland." (*Macariæ Excidium*, p. 247.)

5. We find in the diploma the same confusion between the two powers, ecclesiastical and secular, as I have noted in the Apocryphal Bull. It is not to bishops, but to a worldly prince, that Pope Alexander is seen to confide the mission of working the *moral* reformation of a barbarous

people, Christian only in name—of *reforming the Church*, heretofore without order in Ireland—of making the nation really Christian.¹ Are such ideas tolerable?

Henry II., at the time of his dreadful conflict with St. Thomas of Canterbury, asked much less than Pope Alexander is here supposed to grant him. He submitted, no doubt, but he reserved to himself the taking of revenge,

¹ Archdeacon Lynch, in his valuable work *Cambrensis Eversus*, subjects the alleged Bulls of Adrian and Alexander to a long and learned examination. "I am confident," he says, "that these Bulls are full of errors, and that most of their statements are utterly groundless, an assertion which can be more easily substantiated by examining their blunders in detail." He scouts the idea of a Pope employing such an agent as Henry II., a man full of evil propensities, for a great and difficult work of moral reformation; of writing letters so different from the true papal style, so abusive, so devoid of all paternal tenderness for the Irish people; and of departing so far from the spirit of the Holy See as to treat the Irish Bishops with an utter want of ceremony—reducing them to a rank of secondary importance in presence of an English King, at the head of an invading army. "Tyranny of that kind," he says, "was never known under the mild government of the Popes, whose pious and learned delegates employed gentle and persevering persuasion, not violence and platoons, to civilise the hearts of men, lighting by admonition the path for voluntary obedience, not goading them against their will at the point of the sword. When the Apostles went forth to propagate the faith, they were not allowed to carry even a staff; and can it be lawful for their successors in that sacred duty to force by arms some nameless sort of reformation on men eminently instructed in religion? Arms rather barbarise than civilise man. War destroys learning and law, levels cities, burns houses, devastates lands, tramples the corn fields . . . in a word, throws everything into disorder. A most contemptible fool the man must be, who first invented the story of the adoption by the Apostolic See of so preposterous a mode of reforming the morals of any nation." Dr. Lynch thus goes on to prove by innumerable arguments that the aforesaid Bulls were mere forgeries. Vol. ii., chap. 22-25. Ed. by the Rev. Dr. Mat. Kelly.

If the English translation of *Cambrensis Eversus* by Dr. Kelly, which is done in very good style, were published in one volume by itself, it would be a great boon; for few readers can be expected to take up the three large volumes, containing both Latin and English texts. Unfortunately, however, the notes attached by Dr. Kelly, though according to the views held by many persons in his day, are usually out of all harmony with the remarks made by the Author. A correcting or reconciling hand would therefore be required, and this would entail trouble, but far less than that of making another translation. Considering the many new lights thrown on history during the past fifty years, a great advance towards truth might be expected.—*Trans.*

thanks to the diplomas which he would one day have forged under his eyes.

CHAPTER XX.

APPEARANCE OF THE APOCRYPHAL BULL IN ENGLISH CHRONICLES.

It seems to me certain, and I shall prove it in the course of the following chapters, that the English chroniclers took the Apocryphal Bull from Giraldus Cambrensis, who, first of all,¹ published it, in his history of the Conquest of Ireland.

Giraldus composed a great many works. Being in Rome, he presented copies of them to the Pope, and to other personages ; but he took care not to let them see the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, which contained the false Bull of Adrian IV.² Thus, having gone to Rome in 1199, he presented six of his works to Pope Innocent III.—among others, the *Gemma Sacerdotalis* : the conquest of Ireland does not figure there. (Works of Giraldus, new edition, Brewer, 1861, vol. 1, p. lxx.)

In the *Symbolum Electorum* we see a letter written by Giraldus to the Dean or Chancellor of the Roman Court. He sent him the Topography of Ireland and the Description of Cambria, but no History of the Conquest. (*Ibid.*, p. 308.)

As Giraldus, revising his *Expugnatio*, made of it, during

¹ It is likely that Giraldus, being a courtier, accepted without any question any document supplied to him by Henry, and gladly inserted it in his book. It is likely also that the King regarded the publication of the book as a golden opportunity for the introduction of a forgery, and considered himself fortunate in meeting with such a credulous author as Giraldus, who always thought himself twice the man he was, and expected everybody to believe him.—*Trans.*

² This would seem to imply that Giraldus himself had some suspicions regarding the Bull, and was afraid to bring it under the notice of the authorities at Rome, lest some more scrutinising glance should reveal its true character. But then he would no longer be in *bona fide*. We may therefore suppose that his motive was not to draw any attention to the doings of the English in Ireland, which were so contrary to the intentions of the Pope, and which, if known, might lead to a revocation of the supposed Bull.—*Trans.*

his lifetime, two or three different editions, of which the last, dedicated to King John, seems to have been in 1209, I cannot dispense myself from a notice of the author's life and works. This task is now easy, thanks to the laborious studies of Mr. Brewer and the Rev. Mr. Dimock, who have published the most recent edition.

Born about 1150, Giraldus went to study in Paris, and returned to England at twenty-two years of age. In 1175, the Archbishop of Canterbury confided to him a mission in Wales, and appointed him Archdeacon of Brecknock. It seems certain that Giraldus returned to Paris about the end of 1176.

It was only in 1184 that King Henry II. brought him to Court, in quality of chaplain. Giraldus rendered him all the services he could, in Ireland and in Wales, by his acts and by his writings. Nevertheless, Henry bestowed no favours on him, because he was related to some of the chief families among the Welsh. Giraldus complained bitterly of this neglect, especially in his biography (*De rebus a se gestis*), written about 1204 : "Cum ergo pluribus annis curiam sequendo fideliter servasset, et ad Walliam pacificandam et in pace tenendam profecisset ; tamen propter parentelam qua Resum filium Griffini et alios Walliæ principes contingebat, nihil a rege (Henrico) qui tot ditabat et promovebat indignos, præter vacua veris promissa suscepit." (Vol. I., 57.)

Sent into Ireland in 1185, as tutor and counsellor of King John, he there found materials for his Topography, and for the History of the Conquest, which he wrote in the two or three years following.

In 1189 he was in France. After the death of Henry II., Richard Cœur de Lion sent Giraldus to put Wales into a state of defence. The same year Giraldus was named assistant to the supreme justiciary of England, the Bishop of Ely.

The fixed idea of Giraldus, that which filled his life, was to withdraw his country, Cambria, from the metropolitan jurisdiction of Canterbury, and to erect an archbishopric in the Cathedral of St. David. With this view, he had placed himself at the service of the Court. From the same motive, he constantly refused the bishoprics that were

offered to him : Bangor, in 1190 ; Landaf, in 1191 ; and so of others.

Having abandoned the Court in 1192, he retired to Lincoln, and remained there seven years, occupied with studies, and with the writing of various works : such as the Life of Galfridus, Archbishop of York, written in 1193. and the *Gemma Sacerdotalis*, about 1197.

The next year saw the beginning of the troubles of Giraldus, as a candidate for the Bishopric of St. David's. Postulated by the Chapter, with three other subjects, in 1198, he was the only one at the commencement of the following year. On the 29th of June, he obtained, no longer simple postulation, but canonical election. Having set out for Rome to pursue the matter, he arrived there about the feast of St. Andrew, 1199, and found Pope Innocent III. disposed to restore the metropolitan right of St. David's. The Pontiff, however, asked for the vouchers of ancient erection. Giraldus could not present them, and after a suit of four years, he had to yield before the implacable opposition of the King of England and the Archbishop of Canterbury.

Discouraged and embittered, he returned to England, and resigned his archdeaconship to his nephew William. During the years 1204 and 1205, he wrote a Description of Cambria, *Symbolum Electorum*, *Speculum Duorum*, *Invectiones*, the Life of St. Regimus, and his own Autobiography. About 1209, he prepared the last edition of *Hibernia Expugnata*, with a dedication to King John. About 1218, he wrote the Dialogues *De jure Menevensis Ecclesiæ*. About 1220, he completed *De Principis Instructione*, in which he disclaimed the diploma of Alexander III. ; afterwards the *Speculum Ecclesiæ*, and a second edition of the Dialogues. The year of his death is not known.

The first edition of the Conquest, dedicated to Richard Cœur de Lion, Earl of Poitiers, could hardly have been finished before 1188¹—previously to the death of Henry II. As regards the last edition, the time is fixed by its dedica-

¹ If it contained Adrian's Bull, this would be thirty-three years after the supposed date (1155) of the Bull. Pope Adrian IV., King Louis VII., and John of Salisbury, being long dead, Henry might now have the Bull spoken of, in public as well as in private, with little fear.—*Trans.*

tion to King John, about 1209. Therefore, between these two dates we must place the divulging of the Bull attributed to Pope Adrian IV. It is not easy to be more precise.

In the manuscripts that have come down to us, we remark some important variations and considerable suppressions. We also find there some parts inextricably confused. Thus, some manuscripts leave out the diploma of Alexander III., and do not even allude to it. Scribes have, in consequence, modified the preamble ; and by an inconceivable mistake, they have represented Henry II. as soliciting in 1172 a privilege from Adrian IV., who died in 1159. Then, by a confusion no less strange, they represent John of Salisbury, who, it is said, obtained a privilege in 1155, as sent in 1172, not to Ireland, but to Rome, with the view of publishing the diploma at Waterford in 1174 or 1175. (See the judicious observations of the Rev. Mr. Dimock, vol. v., p. xlii.-li.)

In the last edition, finished about 1209, the suppressions are more considerable than in the previous ones. Dimock sees in it a trace of that resentment which Giraldus nourished against the royal family, who, instead of rewarding his services, had opposed his most ardent wishes for the religious independence of Cambria. (*Ibid.*, p. xlv.)

Camden, in his compendium : *Anglica, Hibernica, &c.*, followed the manuscripts which show considerable suppressions, and which have caused the greatest confusion in regard to pontifical diplomas connected with Ireland. (*Ibid.*, p. 315.)

What may lead us to believe that the pretended Bull of Adrian IV. was pretty late in being divulged is that neither William of Newburgh nor Roger de Hoveden appears to have had any knowledge of it.

Giraldus seems to have believed *bona fide* in the genuineness of the Bull. He inserted it anew in his autobiography (*De rebus a se gestis*), written about the year 1205 ; but he cited the Bull only with a view to show that the reverses of the English in Ireland came from the fact of their not having observed the conditions prescribed by Pope Adrian, especially in regard to Peter's Pence. (*Ibid.*, p. 61.)

In the autobiography, the diploma of Alexander III. is completely omitted, as well as all reference to a pretended

publication of the two Bulls in a Council at Waterford, related in the *Expugnatio*. These suppressions and contradictions leave everything in confusion and uncertainty.

About 1209, all Ireland was in revolt,¹ and the English prince lost nearly all his possessions. In a letter accompanying a copy of the last edition, Giraldus represented to King John that these misfortunes ought to be attributed to a violation of the promises made in regard to Ireland. "Your father," he says, "wisely providing for himself and his posterity, promised two things to Pope Adrian IV., in order to obtain authority to invade the land of Ireland and make a conquest of it. This aggression, so terrible and so bloody against Christians, was sanctioned by the highest authority on earth, on condition of exalting the Church in that region, and of giving to the Blessed Peter the annual penny for every house, as is done in England, according to the privilege of the said Pope, which your father asked with prudence and circumspection, and which is faithfully kept² in the archives of Winchester. . . . It is without doubt by reason of these two promises, not yet fulfilled, that the advantages of the conquest and the good effects that it ought to produce have been so long delayed, and that the chief men among the conquerors of Ireland . . . have not deserved to leave any legitimate descendants. Nor is this surprising. In point of fact, the clergy of the island, impoverished, are plunged in the deepest misery. The cathedral churches mourn the loss of the extensive lands and domains with which, in former days, they were piously and devoutly endowed; they have been despoiled of them by the first conquerors, or by their companions and successors. And thus an exaltation of the Church there is changed into a spoliation of the churches. . . . That God may share in something of this conquest which has cost so much blood, it will be necessary to give hence-

¹ At this period, the Irish had learned by sad experience what were the real objects of the invaders, and could not but be filled with indignation at such a record of hypocrisy, treachery, and villainy. The motto of the English in plundering Ireland would seem to have been "*Quocunque modo*."—*Trans.*

² If "faithfully kept," as of the utmost importance, how is it that no trace of it can now be found, or indeed has ever been seen, while we have other documents, both genuine and forged, of the same period? The reason seems to be that it never existed.—*Trans.*

forth the promised Penny. It is a very small, a very modest contribution. It frees everybody, and burdens nobody. I add with the same earnestness that, to preserve the memory of the conquest of Ireland by the English, it would be well to establish firmly an annual tribute of gold, of game, or even of trees, as a perpetual testimony that the kingdom of Ireland is bound by an inviolable chain to the Crown of England." (Giraldus, v. 408.)

Hence result several important facts. 1. In 1209, Peter's Pence had never existed in Ireland. 2. The families of the first conquerors were destroyed, annihilated. 3. The Irish clergy were reduced to a state of extreme poverty. 4. The property of churches had been pillaged by the English. 5. The false Bull of Adrian was preserved, according to rumour, in the archives of Winchester. 6. Giraldus, it seems, continued in good faith, sincerely believing in the genuineness of the Bull. 7. The advice that Giraldus gave to establish an annual tribute as a perpetual testimony of the subjugation of Ireland to the Crown of England, seems to have been followed by King John, when, four years afterwards, he offered to Pope Innocent III. to pay to the Holy See an annual quit-rent of three hundred marks sterling, in the name of Ireland. Later on, I shall say whether the Pope accepted this token of sovereignty.

CHAPTER XXI.

AUTHORITY OF GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS.

IT must be admitted that in these latter times, thanks to the conscientious labours of Mr. Brewer and the Rev. Mr. Dimock, the authority of Giraldus, as a veracious historian, has fallen very much in the learned world.

Mr. Brewer, whose first volume appeared in London in 1861, is not afraid to reproach Giraldus with his credulity, and his continual references to old prophecies, as well as to his own visions ; again, with the discourses that the historian places on the lips of Norman and Welsh adventurers, and of Irish chieftains, in which they make quotations from Greek and Latin authors—Julius Cæsar, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, and others. " They leave us to regret,"

adds the editor, "that a quality of mind so valuable had not been strengthened and improved by a more sober and regulated judgment." (Vol. I., p. xlv.)

According to the Rev. Mr. Dimock, Giraldus was too passionate to be impartial. The picture that he draws of the Irish is unjust. Forgetful of St. Malachy, he maintains that since the days of St. Patrick, no Irish bishop has acquitted himself worthily of the pastoral charge. Little caring to find out the truth, he easily accepts the statements of others. "I think," says Mr. Dimock, "I have said enough to justify me in refusing to accept Giraldus's history of the Irish and of their English invaders as sober, truthful history." (Vol. v., p. lxix.)

Truth was not the main object kept in view by Giraldus. He acknowledges that he took up his pen to glorify King Henry II. : *Topographiam Hibernicam . . . in patris vestri laudem triennii labore digessi.* (*Ibid.*, p. lxx.)

The history of the Conquest of Ireland is certainly, in a great measure, a poetic fiction, rather than true and sober history. Unfortunately, it is not always possible to distinguish where the poetry ends and the prose begins. This is another remark made by the same editor. (*Ibid.*, p. lxxi.) Nor does he believe that anything can elsewhere be found so absurd as the orations which Giraldus puts into the mouths of his heroes. It is the mountain bringing forth the mouse. Giraldus made an epic poem.¹ (*Ibid.*, p. lxx., note 4.)

¹ The Rev. Mr. Dimock, in his preface to Vol. v., says: "From his wide acquaintance with the first invaders of Ireland, and his close connexion with several of their principal leaders,—from the time also that he spent there in his two visits,—we may be inclined to conclude that Giraldus's means of information about Ireland, and its people, and its conquest, as he much too grandly calls the English invasion, must have been abundant and authentic. But there are several circumstances which render such a conclusion a very unsafe one . . . As to his history of the English invasion, it must have been wholly derived from the English themselves, and in great measure, no doubt, from his own near friends. If Giraldus had been the most cool, and fair, and unbiassed of writers, still a history so derived could not well have been anything but one-sided; it would be almost impossible that the English and their doings should not be more or less represented in colours too bright, and the Irish and their doings in too dark colours, and moreover, that the English, his own near friends, should not be unduly exalted to the disparagement of others. But Giraldus was replete with

CHAPTER XXII.

THE ENGLISH CHRONICLERS APPEAR TO HAVE ALL TAKEN THE APOCRYPHAL BULL FROM GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS.

THE greater number of English annalists make little use of Giraldus, and are content, as regards the affairs of Ireland, to draw on the little information supplied by Roger de Hoveden and William of Newbridge. However, Higden, in his *History of Henry II.*, appears to have employed the treatise *De Instructione Principis*, and perhaps also the *Expugnatio Hibernica*. Brompton seems to have taken from Higden what he says on the same facts.

the exact qualities the very reverse of what are needed to form an impartial historian. A man of marvellously elastic self-confidence that nothing could put down, an overflowing self-conceit that would be deemed a mere absurd caricature if any one but himself had depicted himself, he looked down with sublime contempt upon everyone and everything that did not agree with his own notions; he had not an idea that anything he thought or said could by any chance be wrong. . . . He was the man of all others whose nature rendered it simply impossible for him to write a fair history of any sort, and least of all of Ireland, and the Irish, and the English invaders, with so many of his own near relations among the latter" (pp. lxi. lxiii.)

Mr. Edward A. Freeman, in his continuation of the preface to Vol. vii., says; "In estimating the historical value of any work of Giraldus Cambrensis, we must remember the two-fold character of the man with whom we are dealing. We are dealing with one who was vain, garrulous, careless as to minute accuracy, even so far careless as to truth as to be, to say the least, ready to accept statements which told against an enemy without carefully weighing the evidence for them. We are dealing with one who was not very scrupulous as to consistency, and who felt no special shame of contradicting himself" (p. liii.)

Mr. George F. Warner, in his introduction to Vol. viii., says of Giraldus: "His character was marred by grave defects. His egotism was unbounded. . . . He was passionate, prejudiced, and vindictive. No one, king or subject, who crossed his schemes, or whom he chose to regard as his enemy, could hope for his good word" (p. xxi.)

These volumes were brought out by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, at the expense of the State.

In some respects, Giraldus was really a clever man. He had a great command of the Latin language, both in prose and verse. His frequent quotations show that he had read much and remembered much. But everywhere throughout his works, it is apparent that there was more than one screw loose. We are told in *Rome and England*, by the Rev. Luke Rivington, M.A. (p. 76), that he was sometimes called Gerald the Savage.—*Trans.*

In 1876 Mr. Stubbs published a new edition of Raoul de Diceto, *Imagines Historiarum*. The Apocryphal Bull of Adrian is found in the first volume. As the annalist made no observation on it, the editor adds a note to the following effect :—It is very possible that this copy of the Bull *Laudabiliter* was taken from Giraldus Cambrensis, *Expugnatio Hibernica*, II., 5, which should have been published at the time when Raoul wrote. (I., 300.)

At the year 1171 Raoul relates (like the remaining crowd of English annalists) that the Bishops of Ireland and the Kings of Limerick and Cork submitted to Henry II., but that Roderic, King of Connaught, did not. On this last point, he contradicts Giraldus, who assures us that Roderic submitted like the others. (Page 346.)

Roger de Wendover, a monk of St. Alban's, like Matthew Paris, gives a large portion of the Bull of Adrian, with a preamble saying that King Henry sent messengers to Rome with great solemnity, in order to ask authority to invade Ireland. The Pseudo-Metalogicus says, on the contrary, that Salisbury alone treated of the affair with Adrian IV., and Giraldus confirms this story.

Above all, it was Matthew Paris who contributed to the diffusion of the Apocryphal Bull. It is to be regretted that some respectable historians have thought themselves justified in referring to an author so decried as the monk of St. Alban's, who makes mistakes every moment, and gives as historical facts a number of fables that have no authenticity.¹

Luard, who published in 1874 the *Chronica Majora* of Matthew Paris, refers to Raoul de Diceto in what concerns the false Bull of Adrian IV. He doubtless thought that such was the source from which Matthew Paris took the document.

In the preamble, Matthew draws the long bow by

¹ "There is one witness whom I have learned profoundly to distrust, who has been a prolific source of misstatement in our English historical literature, and that is Matthew Paris. Long ago Dr. Lingard pointed out, and in certain cases proved, the untrustworthiness of the monk of St. Alban's. . . . His summaries, where they can be compared with originals, are quite untrustworthy; and his own comments are almost worthless, except for those who prefer the ebullitions of spleen to a statement of facts."—*Rome and England*, Rivington, p. xxvii.—*Trans.*

additions that are not at all in the Apocryphal Bull. I italicise these exaggerations: "Per idem tempus rex Anglorum Henricus nuncios solemnes Romam mittens, rogavit Papam Adrianum, ut sibi liceret Hiberniæ insulam *hostiliter* intrare, et *terram subjugare*, atque homines *illos bestiales ad fidem* et viam reducere veritatis, extirpatis ibi plantariis vitiorum; quod Papa regi gratanter annuens, hoc sequens ei privilegium destinavit." (II., 300.)

The editor, by his own authority, has put in the margin, Anno 1155. Now, the Apocryphal Bull is without date in Giraldus and others, as I have often remarked.¹

Matthew Paris says no more of Ireland till the year 1171. He gives nothing new, or little known, unless that he formally contradicts Giraldus in reference to the King of Connaught. We must deny that Henry penetrated *hostiliter* into Ireland; for he thought only of providing for his own personal security, as I have said above. Matthew does not refer to the Bull of Adrian again; he takes good care not to assert that it was notified to the Irish, or that it determined the pretended submission of bishops and chiefs. Here is all that the annalist writes of the journey in 1171: "Per idem tempus rex Anglorum Henricus decimo quinto kalendas novembris *hostiliter* Hiberniam intravit, ubi archiepiscopi et episcopi ipsum in regem et dominum receperunt, et ei fidelitatem juraverunt. Regulus de Limeric, et regulus de Chor, et regulus qui Monoculus dicebatur, ei homagium juraverunt. Rodericus autem regulus de Connat, quia regio quam inhabitabat inaccessabilis est, paludibus nimis interjacentibus, in quibus nec vada commoda, nec pontes pervii, nec navigatio tuta habetur, regi occurrere supersedit." (*Ibid.*, p. 284.)

¹ It has been the interest of England during the last seven centuries to disguise and misrepresent the origin of its dominion in Ireland. If one writer tells us that John of Salisbury obtained the grant from Adrian; another that Henry petitioned for it; another that Adrian well pleased with the English King, conferred it spontaneously; another that the Irish princes, anxious to end their quarrels, besought Henry to accept the crown of Ireland—we know what to think of them all. We may not always be able, in a confused heap of impostures to discover the exact truth, but we do not go far from it.—*Trans.*

CHAPTER XXIII.

PETER'S PENCE.

WE come to a new presumption against the Bull of Adrian. Innocent III. claimed Peter's Pence from the Bishops of England, but he never asked the tribute on account of Ireland. This is evidence to us that the Bull of Adrian, though entered from that time in chronicles, was not regarded in any serious light.

Thus, Pope Innocent wrote to Cardinal Nicholas, Bishop of Tusculum and Legate of the Apostolic See in England, and to Pandolphus, sub-deacon, and one of the Pontiff's household, in the following terms : " Since every house in England, as you know very well, ought to give a penny yearly for the tribute of the Blessed Peter, the prelates of England, who have collected the tribute in our name, have disposed of it against the will of the master, and have not been afraid to keep the greater part of it for themselves ; they have sent us only three hundred marks, and have kept more than a thousand in their own hands. Wishing, therefore, that the right of the Church may be guarded, we recommend the matter to your circumspection, by the authority of these presents, and we expressly command you to receive at once from their hands the Penny, as they have hitherto paid it, and to oblige them to it, if necessary, by ecclesiastical censure, without appeal. You will then formally enjoin upon them from us to pay the remainder in full. We do not see what title they can allege in excuse ; they are unable to show a concession made to them by the Holy See, or to prove a prescription of a hundred years against the Roman Church, especially if the times of schism are left out." (Rymer, *Fœdera*, &c., I., 189.)

CHAPTER XXIV.

JOHN LACKLAND.

(1213.)

KING JOHN, in 1213, seeing himself almost lost without resource, on the brink of a precipice, placed his person and his kingdom under the sovereignty of the Pope.¹ The Golden Bull, dated the 3rd of October, is in Rymer, vol. I., p. 176.)

“Neither determined by force, nor constrained by fear, but of our own good and spontaneous will, and with the common counsel of our barons, we offer and give freely to God, to His Apostles Peter and Paul, to the Holy Roman Church our Mother, and to our Lord Pope Innocent III. and his successors, the whole kingdom of England and the whole kingdom of Ireland. . . . We have publicly made liege-homage into the hands of the said Legate.”

The prince promised to pay to the Pope a thousand marks² sterling every year, seven hundred for the kingdom of England and three hundred for Ireland, under pain of forfeiture, as well for himself as for his successors.

SECTION I.

The offering of his kingdom to the Holy See furnished King John with the happiest occasion in the world for recalling the Bull of Adrian IV., who, seventy years before, as was said, had made a donation of Ireland to Henry II.

The prince was acquainted with the Bull. Giraldus Cambrensis, four years previously, had dedicated to him the third edition of the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, in which it was recorded. The dedication alone would have drawn the special attention of the prince to this pontifical act.

¹ Whatever may be said of the jurisprudence of the Middle Ages, or the consent of nations, the Pope was supposed always to act with wisdom and prudence, according to reason and religion; and if he found his authority abused, he had the remedy in his own hands. Rome, however, is proverbially slow in making a change.—*Trans.*

² The ancient piece of money called *mark* was equal to 13s. 4d.—*Trans.*

If, then, King John believed in the genuineness of the Bull, could he have omitted to say anything of this old grant? Ought he not rather to have shown that he was already a feudatory of the Pope in Ireland, as successor and heir to his father, Henry II.?

Nevertheless, King John alleges no old title. He expresses himself as making a new concession, as offering spontaneously his kingdom to the Roman Church.

Hence it follows that the Bull of Adrian IV. had, in the eyes of this prince, no worth, no value. He thought probably that silence was what suited him best, and that prudence imposed it.

Neither does Innocent III., in his answer, say a single word of the Bull of Adrian, or the briefs attributed by chroniclers to Pope Alexander III., or to other Pontiffs.

This circumspection is so much the more striking as the Roman Chancery delights in adducing old examples or precedents, and saying that the Pontiff walks in the footsteps of his predecessors, and that he continues what they have done : *Prædecessorum nostrum vestigiis inhærentes, eorumque concessionem approbantes et confirmantes*, &c. The occasion was unique for recalling the Bull of Adrian, and putting it in vigour. It is evident that Pope Innocent knew nothing about such a Bull.

SECTION 2.

Did Innocent accept the sovereignty of Ireland? I do not think so.

On the 27th of October, the same year (1213), the Pontiff addressed a letter to the Irish, which is in Rymer.¹ (Tome I, p. 179.)

The Pope speaks of the kingdom of England, but he never mentions the *kingdom* of Ireland. He calls John King of the English, without adding that he is also King of the Irish. He says that the kingdom of England, by a donation of this prince, belongs to the Church, which has a special right over it. Will Ireland be henceforth in

¹ Thomas Rymer, an English antiquary, became historiographer royal in 1692. He made a large collection of treaties, public letters, etc., under the name "*Fœdera*." It was published in London, in twenty volumes folio.—*Trans.*

like condition with England as regards feudal subjection? Innocent III. does not say so in any manner, explicit or implicit. The pontifical letter may be found (No. 9) among our justifying documents at the end.

Thus Pope Innocent III. abstained from relating that King John had given to the Roman Church not only the kingdom of England, but also the kingdom of Ireland : *Totum regnum Angliæ et totum regnum Hiberniæ*, as the prince himself had said in the Golden Bull of the previous 3rd of October.

Fidelity and devotedness are all that the Pope recommends to the Irish ; he does not speak to them of submission and obedience. In other words, he exhorted the Irish to show benevolence and friendship towards the King of England.

Could Innocent III., who must have been aware that the greatest part of Ireland preserved its independence—could he have had the idea of imposing on the bishops, nobles, and people of the whole island the obligation of submitting politically to King John and his successors? The supposition is absurd. Moreover, facts would belie it ; for the national kings went on peacefully in their course, and the districts unoccupied by the English retained their full independence.

If one wishes to make out at all costs that the pontifical letter commanded submission to King John, this regards only the towns and counties along the coast which the English held from the time of the coming of the adventurers.

If Pope Innocent III. had accepted the political sovereignty of Ireland, he would have granted a solemn diploma to invest King John, a diploma provided with the clauses usual in diplomas of investiture. Now, this diploma never existed for Ireland.

Before everything else, in the hypothesis made, the Pope would have raised Ireland to the rank of a kingdom. Now, it is beyond doubt that the Kings of England did not take the title of *King of Ireland*, except at a much later period. I do not remark the least trace of it in the voluminous collection of Rymer. Henry VIII. himself, three centuries after King John, dedicating his work against Luther to Pope Leo X., entitled himself in his letter King of Eng-

land and *Lord of Ireland* : “ Sanctissimo domino nostro domino Leoni X. Pontifici Maximo, Henricus Dei gratia rex Angliæ, dominus Hiberniæ, perpetuam felicitatem.” All the world knows, moreover, that Pope Paul IV. erected Ireland into a kingdom in 1555, three hundred and forty-two years after Pope Innocent.

Lastly, I observe that Pope Innocent III. abstained from making known to the Irish the annual tribute of three hundred marks sterling which King John had promised.¹

SECTION 3.

The promise of an annual tribute cries out loudly against the Apocryphal Bull of Adrian IV.

Giraldus Cambrensis, as I have said above, had represented to King John, four years previously, that one of the causes of the reverses experienced by the English in Ireland was that they had neglected to establish Peter's Pence there, contrary to a formal promise of Henry II., and contrary to an express clause in the Bull of Adrian IV. Giraldus recommended his royal pupil to establish the Peter's Pence as soon as possible—which would serve as a perpetual testimony of the indissoluble union of Ireland with the Crown of England.

Conformably to this solemn and advantageous counsel, King John should naturally propose and promise to Pope Innocent III. that he would establish Peter's Pence in Ireland. He might fear to see ill-received at Rome the promise of a tribute less than that of the Peter's Pence imposed on the houses of Ireland, in execution of the Bull of Adrian.

But King John learned, perhaps, that the Bull of Adrian was regarded by the Romans as a mere fable. On this account he would think it proper to avoid all mention of Peter's Pence, and to promise a tribute of a thousand marks sterling, of which seven hundred should be for England, and three hundred for Ireland.

Rymer relates several receipts of the tribute of a thousand marks sterling. But the Popes never made any

¹ This is a very interesting analysis of the Pope's letter, which might of itself be misunderstood.—*Trans.*

POPE ADRIAN IV.,

distinction between a portion for England and a portion for Ireland. We may say that the Holy See abstained from acknowledging explicitly that it received any tribute for Ireland.

In 1235, the Cardinals wrote to the King of England, to claim a half of the tribute. The answer of King Henry III. is dated 25th of February. It says that at the time of the first concession of this tribute, it was stated in the charter of King John, his father, that the sum should be given to the Roman Church in an undivided manner. The King paid it into the hands of the Pope ; but whether it all remained with the Holy Father, or was divided, he never knew ; accordingly he advised the Cardinals to have recourse to the Pope himself. "*Universitati vestræ*¹ significamus quod in prima concessione illius census, insertum fuit in carta Joannis patris nostri inde confecta, quod sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ redderetur census memoratus pro indiviso . . . penitus ignorantes hucusque utrum domino Papæ integre remaneret, aut divise. (Rymer, t. I., p. 337.)

In 1276, Pope John XXI. claimed from Edward I. the arrears of the tribute for eight years. The letter is dated from Viterbo, the eleventh of the calends of January, that is, the 22nd of December. (Rymer, II., 77.)

SECTION 4.

When King John offered Ireland to the Pope, he followed the tactics of Henry II., who, at the beginning of his intervention, while as yet he had only a few towns or districts near the shore, boldly appointed a constable, seneschal, or justiciary for all Ireland. Thus did a Roman-Teuton Emperor call himself master of the whole world !

Henry II., in 1177, giving judgment in an arbitration case between the King of Castile and the King of Leon, did not take the title of *Lord of Ireland*. He availed himself, however, of it in some diplomas regarding the interior of the kingdom.

Richard Cœur de Lion never used this title. We are assured of it in Rymer. (T. I., p. 63, 64, 65, 99.)

¹ The sacred College of Cardinals.

John, from the time of his coming to the Crown of England, added to his ordinary titles that of *Dominus Hiberniæ*. However, I do not remark that he took it in letters which he wrote to Pope Innocent III.

In 1204, having need of money for the war against France, he wrote to the clergy of Ireland, begging that they would be so good as to help him in this grave necessity, promising to cherish an undying gratitude for their aid, and never again in his life to ask anything of anybody who should now refuse him. "*Efficax nobis auxilium faciatis in hoc necessitatis nostræ articulo. . . . Et certissime sciatis quod nunquam nobis ab illo auxilium fieri postulabimus qui nobis in hac tanta necessitate auxilium (non?) denegabit.*" (Rymer, I., 136.)

The national kings still preserved their power. King John, in 1208, wrote to them collectively: "*Rex Joannes regi Conaciæ, et omnibus aliis regibus, et magnatibus Hiberniæ, salutem.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 189.)

By a diploma of the 23rd of August, 1214, John took under his protection Cathal, King of Connaught, and his dominions. He wrote to the Archbishop of Dublin to buy *escarlettas*, as much as he believed sufficient, in order to make a feast for the Kings of Ireland and other clients of the King. (*Ibid.*, p. 189.)

In 1219, the King of Man made a donation of his island to the Pope, declaring that he possessed it by right of inheritance, and owed service to no one. He wished that he and his heirs should become vassals of the Holy See, and offered twelve marks sterling of annual tribute. The Pontifical Legate accepted the donation in the name of Pope Honorius. The act was signed even in London: "*Actum London., in domo militiæ Templi kal. Octo' ris, 1219.*" (Rymer, t. I., p. 234.)

A few years afterwards, Henry III. confided to the King of Man (pontifical feudatory), the guardianship of the coast of England and of the King's dominions in Ireland, paying annually forty marks, a hundred measures of wheat, and five tuns of wine deliverable *in terra nostra Hiberniæ*. (*Ibid.*, p. 341.)

Behold how the King was master and lord of all Ireland!

SECTION 5.

What surprises me very much is that, in the acts stipulated between Innocent III. and King John in 1213, all remembrance seems to have been lost of the oath that Henry II. took in the cathedral of Avranches forty years previously. What signifies therefore the donation of King John, if the kingdom of England became a fief of the Holy See in 1172? Henry II. then engaged himself in the name of his successors. Yet it does not appear that Richard Cœur de Lion asked pontifical investiture. As for King John, the case seems clear. If, at the beginning of his reign, he had obtained Roman investiture, there would have been no need to renew the donation of the kingdom of England in 1213. At all events, it is very strange that the submission of 1213 should be regarded as a new concession, when in reality there was nothing new about it, except the annual tribute of a thousand marks sterling, and the promise of renewing investiture at every change of reign.

It might be said that the Anglo-Norman princes cried out for the pontifical sovereignty when they saw themselves almost lost, but that very soon, the danger over, they forgot the service that the Pope had rendered them. Henry III., the son of John, took the oath of fealty and homage to the Holy See. But Edward I. exempted himself from it, and his son Edward II. followed this example.

The Normans of Italy showed a more true and practical fidelity. During the two centuries of their sovereignty at Naples and in Sicily, they obtained more than twenty Bulls of investiture. The princes of the house of Anjou had ten of them, for the 168 years of their sway. As regards the Kings of Aragon and Spain, from 1443 till 1700, the year of the death of Charles II., I count thirteen Bulls of pontifical investiture for the kingdom of the Two Sicilies.

CHAPTER XXV.

STATE OF IRELAND IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY.

IRELAND was divided between two races of men, different in language, in manners, and in laws, and animated with a deadly hatred against each other.¹ The most moun-

¹A good deal of this ill-feeling continues in the twentieth century. It is not exactly a hatred of the English that the Irish have, but rather a hatred of a certain perversity in the character of the English which has made and still makes them inflict many wrongs on Ireland, as if they had no proper sense of justice or humanity. Of course it finds expression in different ways. We cannot be surprised if Sir Horace Plunkett, in his book *Ireland in the New Century*, remarks: "Upon the England that sowed the wind was visited a whirlwind of hostility from the Irish scattered throughout the globe." This writer has no small share of blame to lay on the Irish for their *defects*, but surely many allowances ought to be made for a people so heavily and so unjustly handicapped for centuries. The Irish know pretty well what was the cause of those *defects*, for which none have suffered more than they; and perhaps in their sufferings they have shown more *moral fibre* than their pitiless oppressors. Almost every path to prosperity was closed against them. To say nothing of bad laws, wealthy Protestants were unwilling to invest their capital in Irish labour, and few Catholics, of any wealth, knew how to employ labour in the development of trade, to profit of improvements in machinery, or to engage in safe business on an extensive scale. Hence, the masses of the people, struggling to earn a poor subsistence from land, could not rise above poverty and misery. Such was not the case in other countries, where the upper and lower classes were in good accord. Besides, every nation of Europe, except Ireland, had consuls or agents abroad, who could give information regarding the products of their respective countries, and thus find new markets for them.

To ask now that Irish history should be buried in oblivion is much the same as to ask that England should be unmolested in her various methods of fleecing Ireland. She has indeed made some concessions to Ireland, but to say that the England of to-day is not the England of former days, or even of fifty years ago, sounds rather strange, while we hear ministers of the Crown coldly telling us that the Government has no intention of granting a Catholic University, or while we look at that monstrous anomaly, Trinity College, existing to this day in our midst, with its £65,000 a year, derived chiefly from the confiscated property of Catholics. Is this to govern with the consent of the governed, or, as a Lord Lieutenant lately said, "with a full and constant regard to the traditions of the country"?

It must, however, be admitted that, with some very regrettable lessons, savouring rather much of "amateurishness," Sir Horace has given us a large number of useful ones. He is Vice-President of the Department

tainous districts, and the greater part of Connaught and Ulster, were occupied by the old Irish natives. The English were settled along the eastern and southern coasts. By English we understand a medley of adventurers from different parts of England, Wales, and Guienne—men who, despairing of any fortune in their own country, relied upon their swords to make it elsewhere. They had sworn fidelity to the Crown of England, but this fidelity

of Agriculture and Technical Instruction, which was founded in 1900, with an annual income of £166,000, derived in almost equal parts from Irish and Imperial sources, and with a starting capital of £200,000. Practical men like him, diligent students of social problems at home and abroad, might do much to improve a country, as Belgium, Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, etc., have been improved. But if the Department would justify its existence, it should merit the confidence of the Irish people. It should not be turned into an engine of ascendancy, it should not be made a new means of multiplying situations for a small section of the community, and the public should be supplied with a full record of its annual expenditure. In short, it should be an honest institution for the general welfare of Ireland.

The great changes with regard to local government that have taken place within the last few years, may be considered as some partial measure of Home Rule. But, alas! how far are we still from having obtained anything like justice! It is a most lamentable reflection that while the population of Ireland between 1871 and 1904 has fallen by more than a million, the taxation (for British purposes) in the same period has risen from £6,923,402 to £9,748,503, that is by nearly three millions, or 70 per cent. In the present year (1905) it is estimated at £10,378,000. In 1894, when it was only £7,568,649, the Financial Relations Commission decided that this amount was at least 2½ millions too much. If restitution were to be made by England, what an enormous sum would be due to us! It seems that during 1903 there were £14,000,000 of taxation, imperial and local, raised in Ireland, and that large sums thereof were most wastefully expended. The cost of Dublin Castle government went up from £5,970,000 in 1895 to £7,214,000 in 1902. Yet Belgium, which has four times the trade of Ireland, and a much larger population, is governed at about half the cost. The law and police charges in Ireland are three times as great as they are in Scotland. And all the while, innumerable wants, which no Department can reach, call loudly for a remedy. As regards education alone, the Catholic Bishops lately declared: "The first condition of a radical reform of Irish education is the establishment of a University system that the vast majority of the Irish people will accept. Until that is done, we shall regard all this talk about co-ordination and local control and educational progress as insincere."

Englishmen sometimes say that they are unwilling to endow a Catholic University in Ireland. But we do not require a fraction from them, if only we are allowed to use our own money, and not to have it taken away in millions from us, or if the wealth of Trinity College,

was only a name. Since the expedition of King John, they saw among them no sovereign. Far from the Court, dwelling in a land regarded as foreign, they despised the authority of the King of England. Within the precincts of their strong castles, they defied the severity of the laws. If we except the neighbourhood of Dublin, in which the governors of the English colony resided, the remainder of their territory was divided among a crowd of petty tyrants,

gathered from property in eighteen counties, and the thousands wasted on Queen's Colleges, be properly distributed for the educational welfare of the Irish people.

Catholic education in Ireland being so very incomplete without a University to give a tone to all its parts, and to animate youth in running along the various paths of industry, the energies of an immense number of citizens are paralysed, the channels of prosperity are blocked up, and a heavy cloud of despondency rests upon the land. The just claims of Catholic taxpayers, who form the great majority of the nation, are ignored, and their money squandered on the advancement and enrichment of the ascendancy garrison. The interests of one-fourth the population are consulted; those of three-fourths neglected. How unreasonable and unfair is such a misapplication of the public revenues! No wonder that the Most Rev. Dr. Walsh, Archbishop of Dublin, addressing a large audience lately, should point out the grounds of complaint that Irish Catholics have against the Government for the highly unsatisfactory manner in which it has treated the University question during the last nineteen years. They had first, he said, the assurance of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach in 1885; secondly, in 1889, the promises of Mr. Balfour in reply to resolutions of the hierarchy; thirdly, in the following month, Mr. Balfour's promises to Mr. Parnell; fourth, in the December of the same year, the promises contained in Mr. Balfour's great speech at Partick; fifth, Lord Cadogan's speech at Belfast in 1896; sixth, the assurances given by Mr. Gerald Balfour in the House of Commons; and seventh, the assurances contained in Lord Cadogan's speech to the deputation of the Senate of the Royal University, which waited on him in connection with the appointment of the late University Commission. Yet all has come to nothing. How quickly would these matters be settled, and how many millions of money would be saved or profitably spent, if we had an Irish Parliament, of which, according to many great authorities, we were illegally and unconstitutionally deprived!

Indeed the history of the means by which the Union was carried, shows that it was not the deliberate choice or act of the Irish people, but more like a great swindle effected by the enemies of Ireland. If justice has any place among men, so grievous a wrong ought to be righted with all speed. As the learned Bishop of Limerick has remarked: "Aliens can never rightly rule any people. No matter what their intentions or dispositions, they are working against nature when they take into their own hands the power and the responsibility which the manifest Providence of God shows should be exercised by the inha-

who knew no other law than their own interest. Unable to deny that they had been aggressors against the indigenous Irish, they regarded them as their natural enemies. All those whom they found within the limits of their district, they reduced to the most abject servitude, and the others they continually harassed by military excursions.

In 1275, King Edward wrote to the Bishops of Ireland, and besought them to labour for the restoration of peace.

bltants of every nation. What is there in Ireland to condemn her to a servitude that would not be heard of in Belgium, or Holland, or Denmark, or amongst any other people?"

The Rev. P. J. Dowling, C.M., Cork, writing some time ago in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, mentioned a number of books that would be instructive for those interested in Irish industries, and desirous to know something of industrial progress in foreign lands. He is a great admirer of the Germans. "In somewhat over thirty years," he says, "their system of technical training has made such a change in the industrial life of that country that it is only rivalled in swiftness, completeness, and beneficence by what we read in fairy tales. Starting with a population mostly agricultural, Germany to-day is turned into a vast hive of industries, where the farmers cannot supply the wants of the workers." Many persons will be glad to learn from him that "the more remarkable technical and commercial colleges, the greatest industries, are to be found in the Rhineland, which, as every one knows, is the most Catholic part of Germany." He speaks of the Exhibition of Dusseldorf, where the Catholics are seven to one, as an extraordinary success—one of the most wonderful exhibitions that the world has ever seen. The machinery hall covered five acres; and the main industrial hall, seven. He says that wages in Germany have increased three, and, in some cases, four-fold; and that "the German workman of to-day, with his retiring pension at 65, is the envy of his comrades the world over." If this important article were re-published among the penny booklets of the Catholic Truth Society, it would be very useful in Ireland. We may confidently expect that the tide of emigration will be stemmed, when people see that they can prosper well enough at home, though their standard of living is not high, without exposing themselves to the heavy toils and unhealthy climates of foreign countries. A series of small books on all the different trades and other industries that might be largely developed in Ireland, would also be very useful. Not the least advantage of it would be that it would help young people to select an occupation for which they seemed to have most taste and talent. In treating of any subject, the author should give the names of the chief tools used, and a simple explanation of the manner of using them. Every lesson or chapter might be limited to a page or two.

An industry fully developed may come to something very great. Thus, the immense, magnificent shirt-factories everywhere to be seen in Derry, in which machinery is turned to the highest account, show what a fortune-making business this must be. In like manner, we learn that a distinguished Prelate, lately visiting the Deaf and

“ Rex venerabilibus patribus archiepiscopis et episcopis terræ Hiberniæ, salutem. Qualiter terra prædicta, per discordias et guerras ibidem diu habitas, depauperata existit fide perpenditis oculata ; unde cum super hoc sumus, nec immerito, anxianti animo et turbati ; et totis desideriis affectamus quod hujusmodi controversiæ et guerræ pacificentur, vobis et fide et dilectione quibus nobis tenemini mandamus, rogantes quatenus, de consilio justitiarum nostri

Dumb Institution at Cabra, Dublin, was told by the good Dominican Sister in charge of the lace manufacture among the girls (over 200) there, that *it would take four years to complete the orders on hands*. Of course, we may presume that the purchasers were notified of this delay, and that, satisfied with the prospect of excellent work, though done by poor girls both deaf and dumb, they expressed their willingness to wait.

It would seem that, after the land of Ireland, the water might be made a source of innumerable advantages. The quantity of water-power unemployed is very great, equal to more than two million horse-power ; whereas in England and Scotland scarcely a drop is lost. It is calculated that the expense of water-power in working machinery is only about one-fourth that of steam-power, so that if it takes £20 to produce one-horse-power for a year by steam, it takes only £5 to produce the same by water. But even if we raise this £5 to £8 or £10, a large margin is still left. As for uniformity in the supply of water during the year, it may be regulated in a great measure by reservoirs and by turbine wheels. Water power may also be utilised to produce electric power. And even bogs, it seems, may be turned to account in like manner. For, according to Monsignor Molloy, Rector of the Catholic University, who is a great authority on scientific matters, there is an absolutely unbounded source of energy in the bogs of Ireland, which is capable of being brought into action by electrical engineering ; so that the Bog of Allen alone could supply motive power more than sufficient to work all the railways of Ireland. What a reduction in rates of transit would then follow ! At present we are told that turf-mould required in Dublin can be brought more cheaply from Germany than from Galway, and that, on account of carriage, coal from Roscommon is dearer in Galway than coal from England.

Another point, not unworthy of attention, is the necessity among us of acquiring good business habits. Many Irishmen are, no doubt, irreproachable in this respect ; but it is to be feared that a considerable number are still wanting in the promptitude and courtesy essential to success. The facilities now offered, not only of transmitting samples, but of making sales, by letter and parcel post, are very different from what they were some eighty years ago. At that time the postage of a letter, weighing a quarter of an ounce, from Dublin to London was 1s. 3d. ; to France, 2s. 3d. ; to America, 2s. 7d. ; to Italy, 3s. ; and to Spain 3s. 3d. Packets were charged at the same rate, every ounce counting as four letters of a quarter ounce each. And all this with

terræ prædictæ et aliorum fidelium nostrorum partium illarum, taliter ad invicem provideatis, quod per divinum adjutorium et vestram circumspectam devotionem, hujusmodi controversiæ et guerræ pacificentur et sedentur. . . . Teste rege apud Wodestolk 12 die Augusti. (Rymer, II., 56.)

Five Irish Kings and the Duke of Anderken (?) had advised the King of England regarding this rebellion, and the troubles raised by two chiefs. This shows that the national Kings retained their dignity. (See Rymer, II., 1061.)

The Irish chiefs did not swear fidelity to the King of England. The King employed request or invitation, not command, when he wished for any service. At the beginning of a war with Scotland, Edward II. asked the twenty-six kings who were at the head of Irish tribes to send him troops ; but they made no account of his petition. Rymer has published the King's letter, dated 22nd of March, 1314. (T. III., p. 476.)

In the invasion of Ireland by the English, we do not find the nature, or the characteristics, or the necessary conditions of a true conquest. Henry II. did not employ the force of arms to subdue the Irish, since he did not engage in a single battle with them.

The effect of a conquest is to change the language, the laws, the manners, and the customs of the conquered people. The characteristics of sovereignty are to give laws to a people, and, by the appointment of various ministers, to see them observed ; to punish or pardon the guilty ; and to make peace or war.

No King of England before James I. enjoyed any prerogatives of power in all Ireland. Two-thirds of the people were governed by their own princes, without any change

great delays. The enormous increase in postal work at present requires good correspondents, to whom a knowledge of modern languages is often of great service. It is well known that numbers of young men are sent over from England to France, Germany, Spain, &c., and *vice versa*, that they may learn the language and business methods of the country, and perhaps settle there as agents of import or export. Every transaction of business ought to be conducted on business lines, in a frank and honourable manner. It would be a lamentable case if people throughout Ireland, writing over to a London house, found themselves treated more satisfactorily than if they wrote to a Dublin house. There is much to be gained by punctuality and urbanity. United with honesty, they make many friends and no enemies.—*Trans.*

in their laws, their customs, or their form of government, only that they had not one Supreme King to unite them all. These princes, in whom even the Kings of England recognised the character of Kings in different charters, appointed their own magistrates and officers of justice. They made peace or war with all freedom, during the space of four hundred years. Although some of these princes became tributaries to the Kings of England, they were not properly subjects ; they enjoyed all the other prerogatives of sovereignty, and, by paying a certain tribute for having peace, they were at liberty to pursue any affair they pleased. The English Government had neither the right nor the power to levy taxes off them, or to disturb their subjects. It is therefore necessary to fix this conquest within its just bounds, and to say that it regarded only the English province. The sovereignty of the Kings of England was unknown outside the limits of that province, although they took the pompous title of Lords of Ireland. This view corresponds to that of Pope Clement III., from the time of Richard Cœur de Lion, as appears by the terms of the commission that he gave to his Legate, of exercising jurisdiction in England, in Wales, and in that part of Ireland which was ruled by John, Earl of Morton : *In Anglia, Wallia, ac illis Hiberniæ partibus in quibus Joannes Moretonii comes potestatem habet et dominium.* (Mat. Paris, an. 1188.)

Up to the time of Protestantism, England never sent into Ireland the forces necessary to extend the conquest, and things remained in the state in which Henry II. had left them. A few hundred men, ill paid and ill disciplined, sent from time to time into Ireland, could not suffice to subdue the natives. The adventurers were mere brigands, lured by the hope of gain. Though encouraged by the Kings of England, who liberally granted them whatever they could take by arms from the Irish, they could hardly defend the frontiers of the English province.

Although King John and Henry III. had extended to Ireland the laws and customs of England, and had made viscounts or sheriffs, and other ministers, to govern the people, it is certain that only the English colony, and a few Irishmen enfranchised by special charters, were taken under the protection of the laws. All the others were regarded as aliens, as enemies of the Crown, in such manner

that the murder of an Irishman was not considered a capital crime, and it was permitted to kill him, even in time of peace. If, on the other hand, it was proved that a murdered man was of English birth or origin, the murderer was subject to all the rigour of the laws.

The Irish could not take an action against those who had done them an injury. It might be said that the intention of those who governed in Ireland for the King of England was to maintain a perpetual separation between the two peoples, so as to be in a way of enriching themselves with impunity—an advantage of which they would have been deprived, if the Irish had been received under the protection of the laws, because then no one could despoil them of their goods. The English were strictly forbidden to make marriages with the Irish, or to have any connection with them. Behold how they had come to reform the manners of the old Irish!

The Romans did not thus treat the peoples whom they had subdued. They gloried rather in polishing and refining nations than in gratifying a sordid desire of wealth. They communicated their laws to their new subjects, whose interests were thenceforth sure of protection; and so many different provinces formed only one single empire.

The state of Ireland during the thirteenth century seems irreconcilable with the hypothesis of a pontifical donation. If Popes Adrian and Innocent had given possession of the island to the Kings of England, Rome would surely have recommended submission on the part of the Irish, who, in their steadfast adherence to the Holy See, would at the very least have represented the reasons that prevented them from accepting English domination. The official diplomas of the Kings of England do not make the slightest allusion to Bulls of Popes or to a donation of the Holy See.

CHAPTER XXVI.

THE PONTIFICAL COURT OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY KNEW
NOTHING ABOUT THE FALSE BULL OF ADRIAN IV.

I ASSEMBLE in this chapter various acts of John XXII., which concur to show that the Pontifical Court had no knowledge of Adrian's Bull from its own archives, or from chronicles, or from public rumour ; so that writers of the lives of Popes passed over in complete silence the pretended donation of Ireland.

SECTION I.

In 1316, a little after the election of John XXII., King Edward II. sent three knights to the Pontifical Court as ambassadors, to offer the tribute of a thousand marks sterling, promised by John Lackland, and to excuse him with regard to arrears, which extended to twenty-four years. The Continuator of Baronius has published the letter by which Edward accredited these ambassadors. Now, this prince makes no distinction between England and Ireland for the tribute. He did not at all say that seven hundred marks were for the kingdom of England and three hundred for the seigniory of Ireland, conformably to the diploma of King John : " *Ad excusandum nos super solutione annui census mille marcharum, qui a nobis per sacrosanctam Romanam Ecclesiam exigitur, non facta.*" I ought, however, to say that the ambassadors made this distinction. As the arrears extended to twenty-four years, they promised to pay a fourth during the next four years. (Annals of Baronius, 1316, num. 24.)

The Holy See, which had not granted the investiture of Ireland, could not expressly recognise that a part of the tribute had reference to this island. Moreover, the King of England had at this period only a very small portion of the country, and the Pope should, from a sense of justice, guard the right and the independence of the national chiefs. In reality the offering of King John seemed rather to be regarded as a snare that he had laid for the Pope, with a view of obtaining for himself a title of sovereignty over Ireland.

SECTION 2.

If the Pontifical Court had known the Bull of Adrian IV., a most favourable occasion for turning it to account occurred when John XXII. asked King Edward to render liege-homage, and to take the oath of fealty, as a vassal of the Holy See. The pontifical letter, dated from Avignon, the sixteenth of the calends of April, in the first year of the pontificate, may be read in the Continuator of Baronius. (An. 1317, num. 43.)

John XXII. took nothing as the foundation of his claim but the diploma of King John. He passed over in silence the promise of Henry II. and the pretended Bull of Adrian. An explanation is offered in strictness that the Pontiff abstained from mentioning the oath which Henry took in the cathedral of Avranches, supposing that truly it was then agreed to keep secret the clause relating to the feudal subjection of England towards the Pope. As a matter of fact, the Holy See makes it a point of honour to keep conscientiously the secrets confided to it. But this motive did not exist for the Bull of Adrian IV., nor for the diplomas attributed to Pope Alexander III. This is the reason why John XXII., if he knew this Bull and these diplomas, should naturally make use of them, and recall to the memory of King Edward that his power over Ireland was derived from a pontifical grant long anterior to the times of King John.

Thus, John XXII., so deeply informed in things of the Holy See, and so well assisted by intelligent searchers, such as Bernard Guidonis (or Di Guido), found in the pontifical archives no trace of Adrian's Bull or the pretended diplomas of Alexander. He did not even know them by rumour or by chronicles.

For after reminding King Edward that John Lackland gave his kingdoms to the Roman Church with their rights and dependencies (*cum omnibus juribus et pertinentiis suis*), and promised that his successors would render homage and pay an annual tribute, under pain of forfeiture, John XXII. says that all this is proved by rumour and by chronicles: "Prout hæc omnia fama notificat, et chronicarum inspectio manifestat." It follows logically

that the Pontifical Court had never heard mention of Adrian's Bull, and that it knew nothing of the English chronicles which give it. Therefore, Giraldus Cambrensis, Raoul de Diceto, Roger de Wendover, Matthew Paris, and others, who had written their chronicles more than a century before, were unknown at the Pontifical Court in 1317. In the absence of the minutes of Adrian and authentic registers, John XXII. might have had recourse to public rumour (*fama notificat*) and to the chronicles of historians (*chronicarum inspectio manifestat*). Since the Pontiff does not speak of them in his letter, his silence leads us to suppose his complete ignorance in regard to the documents of which there is question.

Although King John had promised that his successors would render homage and take the oath of fealty, it appears that the Kings of England did not fulfil exactly their obligation. The letter of March 17, 1317, proves that if the Kings paid the tribute, they neglected the homage and the oath. "Aliqui tamen ex successoribus ipsis, et præsertim tu ac genitor antedictus, præstare fidelitatis hujusmodi juramentum, et recognoscere memoratum homagium eisdem prædecessoribus nostris Romanis Pontificibus omisistis." (*Loc. cit.*) The Pontiff exhorted Edward II. to place the homage and the oath in the hands of the two Cardinal Legates who were in England.

Did the King yield to the exhortation? The Continuator of Baronius says that it is not certain: *Obsecutum pontificiis jussis Eduardum non constat.* (*Ibid.*) However, the annalist gives another letter in which John XXII. says to the King that he would gladly, for the moment, close his eyes to the question of homage: *Ut de recognitione taceamus ad præsens.* (Year 1318, n. 28.)

SECTION 3.

So true is it that the Pontifical Court knew nothing of the Bull attributed to Pope Adrian that the Irish themselves felt obliged to send a copy of it to the Cardinal Legates and to the Pope; but John XXII. took good care not to believe in the genuineness of the document: "Quas (litteras) prædictus Adrianus prædecessor noster eidem Henrico regi Angliæ de terra Hiberniæ concessisse

dicitur." The Pope therefore knew the Bull of Adrian only by the complaints of the Irish, who, on their side, brought forward the Bull as an argument *ad hominem* against the King of England.

Here are the circumstances. Unable to bear the heavy yoke that the English laid on them, the chieftains and the people of Ulster took up arms, and called to them Edward Bruce, brother of the King of Scotland. To justify their revolt, they sent to the two Cardinal Legates of England a complaint of which I shall speak further on. They added to their memorial a copy of the Bull, in order to show that the English could not take their stand on this document, since they had constantly eluded or violated **its clauses and conditions.**

The Continuator of Baronius precedes the reply of John XXII. with the following remarks :—"The Irish addressed to the Cardinal Legates some letters full of very grave complaints, and declared that it was this intolerable tyranny which had compelled them to take up arms against Edward, and that this prince had violated the laws under which Pope Adrian had given Ireland to England. Informed of all this by the Cardinals, John XXII. exhorted Edward to lift the yoke off the people, and to let them see his clemency." (An. 1317, n. 43.)

The annalist tells us that the letter to King Edward is preserved in the first volume of secret letters, No. 56 ; in publishing it he suppresses two passages. It is also found in an old Roman Bullarium, edition of 1588, and in some historians, but falsified in a part of considerable importance.

"John, bishop, servant of the servants of God, to Edward, the illustrious King of England, health and apostolic benediction. The earnest exhortations that we address to you, most dear son, in order that you may do what pleases the Judge truly just, preserve peace in the lands and among the subjects of your kingdom, and provide for what may contribute to your renown and your glory, come from that paternal love with which we desire the exaltation of your highness. You ought therefore to receive them affectionately, and to show yourself willing and ready to comply with them. Behold, son, we have received letters that the magnates and people of Ireland

sent lately to our dear sons, Gaucelin, Cardinal Priest of the title of Saints Marcellinus and Peter, and Luke, Cardinal Deacon of the title of Saint Mary *in via lata*, nuncios of the Apostolic See—letters that they have enclosed to us in their own. We have read there, among other things, that Pope Adrian, our predecessor, of happy memory, granted, under a certain manner and form expressed in apostolic letters, the dominion of Ireland to your ancestor Henry, King of England, of illustrious memory. This King and his successors, the Kings of England, even to our own times, not observing the manner and form aforesaid, have, on the contrary, transgressed against every rule ; and, by cruel vexations, unheard-of oppressions, insupportable burdens, and inhuman tyrannies, crushed the Irish people to the dust, so much the more miserably and intolerably as these afflictions have lasted longer. Nor was there any person who would remedy these evils, or correct these disorders. No person seemed to take pity on their misfortunes, although they had recourse to you regarding them, and the loud cry of their distress burst at times upon your ears. Wherefore, no longer able to endure such wrongs, they have felt obliged to withdraw from your house, and to invite another prince to be their ruler. If these complaints are grounded on truth, most dear son, they are so much the more painful to us as we more ardently desire to see all your affairs prosper. You ought to bring to them all your care, and promptly carry into effect all that may please your Creator. Beware of all that might provoke against you the Lord God Himself, to whom revenge belongeth, who doth not despise the groans of the unjustly afflicted, and who, on account of injustices, rejected His own special people, as we see in Holy Scripture, and transferred kingdoms. At a time so troubled as this, we still more earnestly desire that you should enter into those dispositions which are most proper to gain affection and submission in the hearts of the faithful, and that you should avoid everything calculated to detach them from your service. Because, therefore, son, it is your own greatest interest to avoid the risks of change, and to oppose the beginnings of disturbance, lest they dangerously increase and remedies come too late, we beg your royal highness, at the same time persuading with wise counsel, to reflect seriously on

the aforesaid grievances, and to provide, by all suitable ways and means, for their due and prompt redress. You will thus please Him by whom you reign ; and, faithfully accomplishing your duty, every cause of complaint against you will cease. Through these measures the said Irish, led by a more wholesome counsel, may submit to you as lord, or if (which we hope will not be the case) they wish to remain in rebellion, they will turn their cause into a manifest injustice, and you will be excused before God and men. In order that you may know thoroughly the grievances and complaints on which the Irish rely, we enclose in the present letter that which the aforesaid Cardinals have sent us, and also a copy of the letter which the aforesaid Adrian, our predecessor, is said to have granted to Henry, King of England, regarding the land of Ireland. Given the 3rd of the calends of July."¹

I do not consider it necessary to point out the severity with which John XXII. brands oppressions condemned by the Divine law and by conscience, and gives the King to understand that the cause of the Irish would be perfectly just if the prince did not hasten to banish iniquities too long committed. But, I ask, is the language of John XXII. that of a sovereign? If, in the mind of the Pontiff, Adrian had made a donation of Ireland, or if Pope Innocent III. had accepted the sovereignty of the island that King John offered him with that of England, would John XXII. have been able to appear so disinterested in the matter? Would he have limited himself to speak only in the name of justice and conscience? It seems to me that, in the hypothesis of a political sovereignty, the Pope would have charged the Legates to proceed to an investigation, and to judge between the King, a pontifical feudatory, and his vassals, who were at the same time vassals of the Roman Church. He would have written direct to the Irish, in order to promise them a redress of their grievances, and to stay the progress of the conflagration. As he did not do so, his letter furnishes a new argument against the Apocryphal Bull of Adrian.

Let us now come to the falsification of which I spoke above. It occurs in the last article of the letter of John XXII. As a matter of fact, according to the Con-

¹ 29th of June.

tinuator of Baronius, who examined the original register, John XXII. expressed himself doubtfully regarding the Bull of Adrian: *concessisse dicitur*. Now, English writers, falsifying the passage, have used these words: *Adrianus Henrico regi Angliæ de terra Ibernix concessit*. According to them, John XXII. would have admitted without dispute the genuineness of Adrian's Bull. Irish historians themselves, not suspecting that any one would have dared intentionally to alter the text, have adopted *concessit*. Thus, Peter Lombard, Archbishop of Armagh, representing the Irish at Rome under Clement VIII., has followed the interpolated text in his book of the Annals of Ireland (p. 260, Louvain edition, 1632). McGeoghegan, who published his *Histoire d'Irlande* at Paris in 1758, copied from Peter Lombard. He would have discovered the fraud if he had consulted the Annals of Baronius, which give the true text in these terms: "Ut autem de prædictis gravaminibus et querelis, quibus prædicti innituntur Ibernici, tuis sensibus innotescat ad plenum, prædictas litteras missas cardinalibus antedictis, tum formam litterarum quas prædictus Adrianus prædecessor noster eidem Henrico regi Angliæ de terra Hiberniæ CONCESSISSE DICITUR,¹ tuæ magnitudini mittimus præsentibus interclusas." (Annals of Baronius, year 1317, n. 43.)

The circumspection of John XXII. is so much the more remarkable, as the Irish who made the complaint appear to have believed in the genuineness of the Bull of Adrian, while protesting that it had been obtained by false representations. This is proved by a passage in the Irish Memorial: "Adrianus, papa, prædecessor vester, non tantum origine, quantum affectione et conditione Anglicus, anno Domini 1170 (*sic*) ad falsam et plenam iniquitate suggestionem Henrici regis Angliæ, sub quo et fortassis per quem sanctus Thomas Cantuariæ eodem anno pro justitia et defensione Ecclesiæ mortem sustinuit, sicut scitis, dominium regni nostri, sub quadam certa verborum forma, eidem, quem potius, ob dictam culpam, proprio debuit privasse regno, de facto et contulit indebite, ordine

¹ Pope John, in his letter to the two Cardinals, uses the same words "concessisse dicitur." See Theiner, *Vetera monumenta Hibernorum*, &c., p. 201. If, therefore, Pope Adrian did not make the grant, every argument built on a contrary supposition falls to the ground.—*Trans.*

juris omisso omnino, anglicana affectione, pro dolor ! ex-cæcante tanti pontificis intuitionem.¹ Hæc pauca de generali progenitorum nostrorum origine, et de miserabili in quo romanus Pontifex statu posuit, sufficiant ista vice."

On the other hand, it is known that the Irish constantly rejected Adrian's Bull as false and apocryphal. Here is a remarkable proof of this fact. The Barberini Library in Rome possesses a manuscript of the fourteenth century, which is a collection of original documents relating to the pontificate of John XXII., at the very time of which we speak. We find there a letter from the lord justiciary and council of Dublin, accusing the Irish of various misdeeds, in particular of generally maintaining that the King of England employed false pretences and Apocryphal Bulls to support his pretended right to the dominion of Ireland : "Asserentes etiam dominum regem Angliæ ex falsa suggestione et ex falsis bullis terram Hiberniæ impetrasse, ac communiter hoc tenentes."² It follows hence

¹ The statement here made in the Memorial is truly extraordinary, when we remember that Pope Adrian IV. died in 1159. It says that, as Pope John XXII. himself knows, Pope Adrian, in 1170, having received a petition full of falsehood and injustice from Henry, King of England, under whom, and perhaps by whom, St. Thomas of Canterbury met his death that very same year, transferred the dominion of Ireland to Henry, when he ought rather to have deprived him of that of England, and he did this without regard to the usual course prescribed by law, being blinded by love of country, for he was an Englishman, not only by birth, but even more by affection. Pope John, observing a prudent silence, takes no notice of the anachronism here set forth, or of the knowledge attributed to himself.

Mr. Laurence Ginnell, in his very able and learned essay on the Bulls, regards this Memorial as (with or without the knowledge of Donald O'Neill) the work of the Ulster Scotch, full of hatred against the English, and desirous of obtaining Ireland for themselves and Robert Bruce. It is found in *Scotichronicon*, a Latin History of Scotland, by John de Fordun. It does not appear in old Irish works.

The Scotchmen likely thought that if Pope Adrian IV. had given Ireland to the English, his successor Pope John XXII. might very well follow such a good precedent, by giving it to them, now that the English had been shown to have so grossly abused their trust.—*Trans.*

² "Moreover, they assert that the King of England, under false pretences and by false bulls, obtained the dominion of Ireland, and this opinion is commonly held by them." An attempt has been made to show that by these words, which are those of one of our highest authorities, the above Latin passage has not been "fairly and properly translated." The critic says that *impetrasse* means obtaining by request—as if he were entitled to say that it has no other meaning. He then throws overboard the words *ex falsa suggestione et*

that the Memorial addressed to John XXII. could not be the work of all Ireland ; for it expressed a conviction that the Bull, though null by having been obreptitiously or surreptitiously obtained, really emanated from Pope Adrian.

In point of fact, this Memorial was sent by O'Neill, King of Ulster, who took the title of heir of all Ireland, as we read in the superscription : " Sanctissimo in Christo Patri domino Johanni, Dei gratia Summo Pontifici, sui devoti filii, Donaldus O'Neill, rex Ultoniæ, ac totius Hiberniæ hæreditario jure hæres, necnon et ejusdem terræ reguli et magnates ac populus hibernicus, cum sui recommentatione humili, devota pedum oscula beatorum. " O'Neill believed that he could speak in the name of Ireland. This does not prove that every assertion in the Memorial ought to be attributed to the whole nation,¹ of

ex falsis bullis, and gives as his concise reading that Henry obtained Ireland by a request. We doubt very much if this is a fair and proper mode of translation.

Du Cange, who is such a great authority on old Latin words, tells us that *suggestio* is another name for *rogatoria litteræ*, or a letter of petition. The courtly Dublin writer, being a scholarly man, employed the specific or official term *suggestio*, and added *falsa*.

The expression " false bull " is sometimes applied to a true bull, obtained by false pretences ; but it is oftener used to denote a forged bull. The context generally shows in which sense it is taken. If A says that he has received a letter from King Edward VII, and B says that it is a false letter, what does B mean but that the letter was never written or sent by the King ?

¹The facts are well accounted for by the above hypothesis regarding the Scotch.

Referring to this time, Dr. Mat. Kelly, in his notes to *Cambrensis Eversus* (vol. ii., 622), says : " With the exception of the period of Edward Bruce's invasion, there do not appear any evidences of the popular belief that Ireland was a fief of the Holy See. " He did not suspect that the Memorial might have been a Scotch forgery, in which the sentiments of the Irish people as a body were misrepresented. A very correct tradition prevailed among the Irish regarding the fief-title of Adrian's Bull. Let us hear a few further remarks regarding this Bull from Dr. Lynch, author of *Cambrensis Eversus* (vol. ii., 563) :—

" At all events, it is certain that King Henry either did not believe the authenticity of the Bulls of Adrian and Alexander, or the validity of the claim which they purported to give to the sovereignty of Ireland. For we find him distrusting them, and labouring to extort from Pope Lucius III, successor of Alexander, a grant similar to the preceding. Yet, though he had deserved well of Pope Lucius, and sent him a large sum of money in 1183,

which the great majority, I repeat it, never had any faith in the Bull of Adrian.

The Memorial confirms what I have said above on the vexations, oppressions, spoliations, deceits, outrages, mudrers, bloody persecutions, that the Irish suffered from the English. The document is in John de Fordun, volume the third of the Scotch chronicle. McGeoghegan has given most of it in the second volume of his *Histoire d'Irlande*. Dr. Lingard has made an exact and very complete analysis of it. We also meet fragments of it in O'Callaghan's notes to *Macariæ Excidium*.

he was disappointed in his expectations. The Pope refused the request, probably, as well as we can conjecture, because, after an attentive examination of the whole affair, he discovered either that the bulls had never been issued or that they were fraudulently obtained. Hence we find Henry still restless, from the conviction, perhaps, that the preceding bulls had been unjustly procured, and were therefore invalid. Again, he applies to Urban III, the successor of Pope Lucius, and begs a new grant of the kingdom of Ireland. 'In the year 1185, Henry, King of England, sent his ambassadors to Urban and obtained many favours, which had been sternly refused by Pope Lucius. One of the concessions was that he was empowered to have any of his sons crowned King of Ireland, and the Pope confirmed that right to him by a bull, and sent to him, as a token of his will and approbation, a crown of peacock's feathers, wreathed with gold.' (*Hoveden*, p. 631) As merchants of slender means cannot get goods on credit, but must pay down ready money, even so this writer has no more claims to the assent of his readers than what his authorities can command. Would it, I ask, have been more troublesome to give a copy of that bull than to make this passing notice of it? Can there be any possible reason for suppressing it but the conviction that it had not really been granted by the Pope? In the very first year of his pontificate, before he was under the least obligation to Henry, could Urban be so indecorous, so flexible, as to grant thus readily what neither the most pressing solicitation nor the choicest favours could extract from his predecessor? Surely he could not take such liberty with the property of others, as to make a present of a whole kingdom to a foreigner, without even communicating his design to the inhabitants, or hearing their defence. Surely he would send some more respectable pledge of his liberality than a hunting cap of peacock's feathers, which would gird, with more propriety, the temples of some stage king in a theatre than the head of a true and real monarch."

In Migne's collection of the letters, etc., of Pope Urban III, there is no such bull as that mentioned above. (*Patrologie*, vol. ccii.) The passage from Hoveden may be found in the edition of his works brought out under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, vol. ii., p. 306.—*Trans.*

SECTION 4.

The pretended Bull of Adrian made so little impression on the Pontifical Court that the historians of the time did not think it worth their while to mention it.

Two Lives of Pope Adrian IV. were written about this very period by men residing at the Pontifical Court. The first had for its author the learned Dominican, Bernard Guidonis, who died in 1331. The other, a larger work, was prepared by Cardinal D'Aragon, whom Pope Innocent VI. raised to the purple in 1359.

Now, in neither is any mention made of the pretended Bull of Adrian IV., giving Ireland to the King of England. However, in the Life of Alexander III., which comes afterwards, Cardinal D'Aragon gives the oath of Henry II. in the cathedral of Avranches, and some other documents. Since he keeps silence on the Bull of Adrian, it is apparently because he found no trace of it in the pontifical archives.

SECTION 5.

The land of the King in Ireland was very far from comprising the whole island. In 1319, John XXII. forbade the invasion of the land of the King in Ireland. If he had been convinced that all Ireland belonged to the King of England by a donation of Pope Adrian, he would have hurled his censures against the aggressors of Ireland in general. Wishing to favour Edward II., who showed good dispositions for the Crusade, and was preparing to set out, John XXII. thought it a duty to protect the dominions of this prince : "*Fide digna relatione percepta, quod nonnulli nobiles et magnates regem ipsum et regnum ac terram suam Hiberniæ invadere ausu temerario et illicite nitebantur.*" This chiefly regarded the Scotch. The Pope inflicted excommunication, and recommended the two Cardinal Legates of England to promulgate the sentence, especially in places near the sea : "*Præcipue in locis maritimis, seu mari vicinis.*" For the Irish dominions of the King of England were situated along the coast. Notwithstanding all this, some Scotch nobles attacked England, and the land of King Edward in Ireland, and did much mischief there. The Pope then wrote

a circular to the Archbishops and Bishops of England (but did not address himself to Irish prelates). He recommended them to denounce publicly the aggressors as excommunicated, especially in maritime districts—and this every Sunday (*candelis accensis*) until repentance.

This circular of John XXII. proves against the pretended donation of Adrian. It is in the *Roman Bullarium* (vol. 3, part 2, p. 177). Also in Rymer (vol. 3, p. 811).

SECTION 6.

In 1327, revolt and disorder spread throughout all Ireland. An ordinance of King Edward, 12th July, 1327, shows the deplorable condition of the country: "*Hibernici inimici et rebelles nostri, terras nostras, et diversorum magnatum qui terras habent in Hibernia, et in Anglia commorantur, devastarunt, et devastant multipliciter indies.*" The King ordered the castles to be fortified. (Rymer, iv., 294.)

Having resolved to go to Ireland, in 1332, the King sent William Burke, Earl of Ulster, before him.

The lords who had domains in Ireland were to accompany the King. The Parliament had decided on this journey for the pacification of the country and for the suppression of the rebellion. Soon, however, the visit of the King was countermanded. Edward offered an amnesty to the chief rebels, English as well as Irish, and appointed as his plenipotentiary Roger Outlaw, prior of St. John of Jerusalem in Ireland. (Rymer, iv., 503, 507, 526.)

As the war with Scotland caused heavy expenses and required strong soldiers, Edward addressed a friendly request to the Bishops of Ireland: "*Vos affectuose requirimus et rogamus, quatenus de tantis hominibus ad arma validis, armis competentibus bene munitis, quantum facultates vestræ commode permiserint, et instans nostra necessitas exegerit, absque excusationis diffugio, subvenire.*" This occurred in 1335. (Rymer, iv., 642.)

SECTION 7.

Edward III. was too much occupied with domestic misfortunes, and the third of his wars with Scotland and France, to concern himself greatly with the affairs of Ire-

land. The old Irish, by repeated efforts, succeeded in reducing the English territory to the narrowest limits. If they had united then in one common effort, they would have been able to drive the invaders into the sea. Their hostilities were only the sudden result of some particular provocation, not of any general plan of deliverance. Several tribes did not hesitate to receive an annual pension from the English Government, as the reward of the services that they rendered, by protecting the colonists of the seaboard against such of the Irish as showed themselves more hostile.

The territory occupied by the English presented a scene of anarchy and confusion. The colonists were divided into two classes, the English by race and the English by birth. The former were the descendants of the ancient aggressors, and considered themselves as the lawful heirs of the lands and revenues acquired by the swords of their ancestors. The second class consisted of persons whom the King had sent over from England to various employments in Ireland, and a multitude of adventurers whom poverty or crime banished every year from their own country. To the old colonists they were objects of special jealousy and hatred. The Government protected and advanced them, in order to make use of them as a defence against the discontent of the others.

SECTION 8.

In 1341, the King married his son Lionel to Elizabeth, daughter of the Earl of Ulster, in the hope that this union would confirm his authority in Ireland. (Rymer, v., 247.)

A few years afterwards, Edward, having need of troops for the war with France, besought the Irish chiefs to send him men, in the name of that regard which they had for him: "*Ad Magnates Hiberniæ, de veniendo ad regem, cum hominibus ad arma et hobelariis. Specialiter vos rogamus, quod ad nos venire velitis. . . . Et hoc sicut nos et honorem nostrum diligitis, nullo modo omittatis.*" The letter is of the 10th July, 1344. (Rymer, v., 417.)

Two years afterwards, Edward learns that disorder continues, because the country is without defence. He sees no other remedy than to have recourse again to the Archbishop of Armagh, and he begs of him to take such

measures as are necessary for the defence of the country and the restoration of peace. (Rymer, v., 669.)

SECTION 9.

The English by race lived in continual contradiction with the laws of the colony. Many of them adopted the dress, the manners, the language, and the laws of the old Irish. Not a few were thus gradually transformed from English barons into Irish chiefs.

At the time when Lionel, Duke of Clarence, governed the English province, a Parliament was assembled; it made the famous statute of Kilkenny. This statute was not directed against the old Irish, but against the descendants of English colonists who had rejected the laws of England for those of Ireland. It enacted that marriage, fostering, and gossiping with the Irish should in future make the delinquent subject to the penalty of high treason, and that any Englishman who adopted an Irish name or custom should be compelled, under pain of imprisonment, to give bail for his willingness to return to the customs of his own country.

The old dissensions among the English still continued, and the Irish continued to extend their conquests.

SECTION 10.

So imminent was the danger with which English power in Ireland was threatened in 1353, that the King forbade prelates, religious, earls, barons, knights, all men fitted for military service, to leave the country, when they should contribute to its defence. The chancellor received orders to arrest and imprison fugitives, *cum equis et her-nesiis suis*. (Rymer, v., 748.)

As matters grew worse, Edward called a great Council, to deliberate on the state of Ireland. He brought together the lords who held domains in the country. The letter of convocation proves that Ireland was almost lost for the King of England. (Rymer, vi., 318.)

SECTION 11.

Edward III. forbade that any of the old Irish should be

appointed to the office of mayor or bailiff—in general, to any employment. He ordered that canonries, parishes, benefices, should be conferred only on Englishmen. (Rymer, vi., 211.)

In 1362, he made a new appeal to the lords who had domains in Ireland, urging them to come forward in person, with their men of arms, to defend the country, which was in danger of being entirely lost. (Rymer, vi., 350.)

Six years afterwards, a new command to the lords to set out for Ireland, in order to defend the country, under pain of the forfeiture of their lands, which the King would dispose of to others. (Rymer, vi., 594.)

SECTION 12.

Richard II. spent six months in Ireland, from October, 1394, to May, 1395. Rymer does not mention any act of the King about Irish affairs. (Rymer, vii., 782.)

What strikes us in the various matters cited above, is the complete oblivion into which the Bull attributed to Pope Adrian had fallen in the fourteenth century. The Kings of England employed the force of arms to maintain their domination ; but in times of the greatest peril, they never appealed to a pontifical donation—nor to an offering of King John—nor to the sovereignty of the Holy See—nor to Roman investiture, which, in truth, had never been given.

CHAPTER XXVII.

OF THE FIFTEENTH AND SIXTEENTH CENTURIES, WITH THE BEGINNING OF PROTESTANTISM.

FACTS give an absolute proof that the Bull of Adrian did not contribute to the preservation of Ireland. In point of fact, it was not known, nor even invented, at the time when King Henry II. and his Norman-Welsh adventurers made their first settlement, to which an inch of territory was not added. The greatest part of the island, therefore, preserved the national independence. Protestantism—behold the true enemy, the true culprit ! Catholic kings

would never have had the thought, much less the power, of having recourse to the cruel gibbets and the frightful confiscations that crushed Ireland.

Rebellion continued to desolate the English colony during a great part of the fifteenth century.

King Henry IV., in 1403, appointing his son, Thomas, Lord Lieutenant; allowed him subsidies for the conquest of the country, and the suppression of rebels and enemies : "Pro conquesta, expugnatione, et resistentia tam rebellium quam inimicorum nostrorum partium prædictarum." (Rymer, viii., 293.)

Twenty years afterwards, Henry V. gave the Earl of March full power to amnesty English and Irish rebels. (Rymer, x., 282.)

In 1430, an Act of Parliament strictly prohibited Irish people from residing in England, and commanded them to return to their own country *cum omni celeritate*. Some dispensations were granted to chaplains and others, on the payment of twenty pence. We note, in passing, that English policy sometimes swarms with contradictions. At the present day, England is full of Irish people. If they withdrew, the manufactories and other industrial establishments could not be carried on. (Rymer, x., 467.)

Henry VII., in a patent of 1494, bears witness to the revolts that frequently occurred : "Universos et singulos tam Anglicos rebelles quam Hibernicos dictæ terræ nostræ, eandem terram nostram in futurum invadentes, et ipsam terram nostros subditos ejusdem deprædare, guerrare seu alio modo destruere sive devastare nitentes," etc. (Rymer, xii., 558.)

Thus, very far from making conquests, the English were hardly able to defend their own territory.

During the War of the Two Roses, the Irish of the Pale were deeply attached to the House of York. Henry VII. turned his attention to the pacification of the colony. He conferred the nominal government of it on his second son, Henry ; but as this prince was only four years of age, Poyning was given him as Lieutenant. The revolt of O'Hanlon, an Irish prince, soon obliged this officer to take the field. At his approach, the indigenous Irish retired to their woods ; and thence, by sudden and frequent sallies, caused great damage to their adversaries.

Poynings assembled a Parliament, which made several statutes to deliver the lower classes from vexatious taxes, to reduce the power of the great lords, to maintain English influence, and to secure the good administration of English territory. The statutes of Kilkenny were revived, but not that forbidding the use of the Irish language, which is hereby shown to have been generally adopted by the English colonists. These measures helped to re-establish tranquillity in the Pale, the English province.

In 1522, Francis I., at war with Henry VIII., raised up enemies against him in Ireland and Scotland. He addressed himself to the chief of the house of Desmond, a family that had always refused to submit to anything more than a nominal dependence on the Crown of England. The Earl of Desmond, dazzled by the hopes of aggrandisement that were held out to him, signed a treaty by which he engaged, in return for an annual pension, to join the French army as soon as it should land in Ireland, and not to lay down arms until he had conquered a part of the country for himself, and the rest for Richard de la Pole, the representative of the house of York. But Francis I. soon forgot his engagements with Desmond: the army never appeared, and the pension was never paid.

When Henry VIII. ascended the throne, the royal authority in Ireland was confined within the narrowest limits. It did not extend beyond a few seaports, and one-half of the five counties, Louth, Meath, Dublin, Kildare, and Wexford. The rest of the country was divided between sixty chiefs of Irish origin, and thirty of English origin, who ruled the inhabitants of their respective regions, and made war as freely as if they were independent sovereigns. To check these hereditary quarrels, Wolsey now resolved on confiding the government of the country to an English nobleman.¹ During two years the Earl of Surrey restrained the turbulence of the lords by the vigour of his administration: but, on his retirement, it was an Irishman, the Earl of Kildare, who took the government.

The innovations of Henry VIII. in regard to religion were received with equal horror by the indigenous Irish

Instead of the Earl of Kildare.—*Trans,*

and by the descendants of English colonists. Lord Gray convoked a Parliament (May, 1536), and, to nullify the opposition of the clergy, these powerful members, who had heretofore voted in Parliament, were, by a declaratory act, termed simple assistants, whose advice might be asked, but whose consent would not be required.

The statutes adopted in this Parliament were copied from those which had been passed in the English Parliament. The authority of the Pope was abolished. The King was declared head of the Irish Church, and the first fruits of all ecclesiastical benefices were to be remitted to him.¹ It was, however, easier to make these laws than to put them into practice. The two races united for the defence of their common faith, and insurrections broke out on all sides.

St. Leger, the successor of Gray, re-assembled the Parliament in Dublin, in June, 1541. The first act of this Parliament was to erect Ireland into a kingdom, and to give Henry VIII. the title of King of Ireland, instead of that of Lord, which he and his predecessors had borne previously : " Although under the preceding title the Kings had all kinds of jurisdiction, power, pre-eminence, and lawful authority belonging to a king ; because his majesty and his noble ancestors were justly, and of good right, and ought to be Kings of Ireland—reputed, recognised and named as such."

Another statute of Parliament shows that in 1541 the English had eleven counties in Ireland, which formed the English province. Ireland comprised thirty-two counties altogether. The following are the eleven counties that made up the Pale, or the English province : Dublin, Meath, Louth, Kildare, Kilkenny, Tipperary, Wexford, Waterford, Kerry, and Limerick.² It is thus acknow-

¹ The author is only making a rapid sketch of events that bear on his subject. He does not propose to discuss every question that arises ; for instance, how any parliament in Ireland could be got to vote such measures.—*Trans.*

² The author or the printer has here omitted one county. At all events, the hold of the English on some of these counties must have been very slight, if worth mentioning.

This error, though it extends to a word, is not so serious as that of the printer mentioned in Rollin's *Treatise on Studies*, who, by the change of a single letter (*mendacitate* for *mendicitate*), made out that all

ledged that in 1541, towards the close of the reign of Henry VIII., the English had scarcely one-third part of the island.

The peerage of the new kingdom was accepted by the lords who had heretofore recognised the authority of the English court ; also by some of the chiefs, who, though vassals in name, had preserved their independence in reality. Ulick de Burgo was made Earl of Clanricard ; Murrough O'Brien, Earl of Thomond ; and O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone. (1543.)

Edward VI., taking up seriously his title of Head of the Church, established in Ireland a kind of " Holy Synod," consisting of one ecclesiastic and two laymen, to grant all kinds of permissions, dispensations, rescripts, privileges, delegations, and other faculties which exceed the ordinary competence of bishops, and for which recourse must be had to the Holy See. Henry VIII. had committed all these things to the Archbishop of Canterbury, who, at least, was considered to belong to the ecclesiastical order ; but Edward went farther, for he shared these powers with two laymen. In this respect, he anticipated by a hundred and fifty years the famous " Holy Synod " that the Czar, Peter I., established in Russia, and substituted for a Muscovite patriarch.

Let us see how the King writes to Antony St. Leger (Lord Deputy of Ireland), the Protestant Bishop of Meath, and Richard Reid, Chancellor : " All Kings who profess the Christian Faith having received from the Most High all power of jurisdiction, we, who bear the special title of Defender of the Faith, ought to take care more than any other that not only the orthodox faith should be cultivated and observed in all its integrity among our subjects, but also that justice should be rendered to every one, according to equity. . . . In virtue of our right of Supreme Head of the Church, English as well as Irish . . . we grant to you and any two of you conjointly the full and

the most eminent men of Greece were great liars all their days, when the meaning was that they lived in great poverty all their days. "Græcorum clarissimi præstantissimique viri per totam vitam in extrema mendacitate versati sunt."

How necessary, we may infer, is care in the copying of manuscripts !
—*Trans.*

absolute power, authority, and faculty of giving, from time to time, in our name, to each and every person of either sex, present and future in our kingdom of Ireland, and living under our Irish government . . . all kinds whatsoever of licences, dispensations, compositions, faculties, concessions, rescripts, delegations, and other permissions, in all cases and causes whatsoever . . . as the Archbishop of Canterbury gives them in our kingdom of England." (Rymer, xv., 146.)

The counsellors of the young King ought to have had the decency to remember that the title of "Defender of the Faith" had been conferred by a Pope.

Not content with usurping papal authority, Edward tried to hinder the true Pope from exercising his power; for instance, he made void a regulation that the Holy See had prescribed regarding the Church of Saint Nicholas in Galway. The most amusing thing of all is that the royal diploma meanly copies the clauses and the style of the Roman Chancery: "Et si secus a quoquam quavis auctoritate scienter vel ignoranter attemptari contigerit, illud irritum decernimus et inane."¹ Edward's "Brief" is dated 29th of April, 1551. (Rymer, xv., 258.)

¹ It has been remarked that St. Thomas's *Summa* was the master piece of reason in the thirteenth century; Dante's *Divina Commedia* the masterpiece of imagination in the fourteenth century; and the *Imitation of Christ*, by a Kempis, the masterpiece of a devout mind, in the fifteenth century. All came forth in a Catholic atmosphere, and were in keeping with the grand cathedrals and other magnificent works of art in those ages. A large portion of Shakespeare's plays formed the masterpiece of a worldly genius in the sixteenth century, at a time when many Catholic sentiments remained, but the religious spirit was dying out. Protestantism, excluding the light of many truths that faith reveals, has never produced anything to equal them—it rather dwarfs and cramps the mind, though it has made great discoveries in regard to steam, electricity, etc. On such matters, however useful, our Divine Redeemer, in whom were hidden all the treasures of knowledge, never deigned to utter a word, as if they were of very minor importance in comparison with the great truths of eternity, or the great work of human salvation.—*Trans.*

CHAPTER XXVIII.

ERECTION OF THE KINGDOM OF IRELAND BY POPE PAUL IV.

(1553.)

IRELAND had never been considered a *kingdom*. It was officially designated the *Land of Ireland*. The Kings of England called themselves *Lords* of this Land. The Bulls of Popes and the diplomas of Kings unite to prove this denomination of *Land* through all preceding ages. As the letter of Adrian IV. to Louis VII. used the same term to designate the country whose conquest was desired by the King of France and the King of England, I have taken an argument from the fact to maintain that the pontifical letter could not apply to Spain, which comprised three *kingdoms*, and consequently did not exist politically as one single nation. King John offered to the Pope the *kingdom* of Ireland. But Innocent III. was not so innocent as to mention the pretended kingdom ; for he wrote to the prelates, knights, and people, *per Hiberniam constitutis* : he did not at all say *per Hiberniæ regnum*. Henry VIII. himself, as I have said above, writing to Leo X., in order to offer him his book *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum*. took simply the title " Lord of Ireland."

The Protestant Parliament that sat in Dublin in 1541 erected Ireland into a kingdom. Edward VI. took the pompous title of " King of England, France, and Ireland."

This example was followed by Queen Mary, called to the throne of England after the death of her brother Edward in 1553. When she married Philip of Spain, son of Charles V., the proclamations and ordinances mentioned, among other titles of these rulers, that of " King and Queen of Ireland."

In Lingard's History, we read as follows : " Pole had foreseen that the new title of King and Queen of Ireland, assumed by Philip and Mary, in imitation of Henry and Edward, might create some difficulty, and had therefore requested that Ireland might be declared a kingdom before

the arrival of the ambassadors. But the death of Julius, succeeded by that of Marcellus, had prevented those Pontiffs from complying with his advice, and the first act of the new Pope,¹ after his coronation, was to publish a Bull by which, at the petition of Philip and Mary, he raised the lordship of Ireland to the dignity of a kingdom. Till this had been done, the ambassadors waited without the city ; three days later they were introduced."

Paul III. had taken it very ill that Henry VIII. assumed the title of King of Ireland, because it was supposed that he did so in contempt of the Holy See. This sentiment has found an echo in the Annals of Bzovius. (An. 1542, n. 11.)

Two official documents regard the erection of the kingdom of Ireland ; first, the consistorial decree, which accomplished this erection, and secondly, the Bull of the same day, 7th of June, 1555.

The Continuator of Baronius gives the consistorial decree, which appears also among the letters of Cardinal Pole (v. 136). The Bull is found in the Roman Bullarium, latest edition (vol. 1, part 4, page 315). It is also in the Annals of Bzovius (vol. xx., p. 301).

The two documents, identical in substance, present the same affirmations and the same clauses, expressed in the same terms. The consistorial decree is as follows :—
 "Rome, seventh day of the month of June, 1555. There was a consistory at St. Mark's. On the relation of the Most Reverend Puteus, the Holy Father erected the island of Ireland into a kingdom. Since the time when the Kings of England acquired the dominion of this island through the Apostolic See, they, for the time being, have been accustomed to call themselves simply its Lords. The royal title was *de facto* usurped, first by the late Henry VIII., after his defection from the unity of the Church and submission to the Roman Pontiff, under pretext of a law made, it is said, by the Parliament of the aforesaid island ; and then by his son, Edward VI.—both of whom, while they lived, held themselves for Kings of England. His Holiness erected the kingdom of Ireland in the manner of other islands, which have the royal title, dignity, and honour : without prejudice to the rights of the holy Roman

¹ Paul IV.

Church, or of any other party that claims to have a right in or to the aforesaid island ; and he adorned and decorated it with the title, dignity, honour, power, rights, and royal insignia enjoyed by the other kingdoms of Christendom."

This consistorial decree is repeated in the Bull. The preamble of the Bull says that the Pontiff, holding the place of Him by whom Kings reign, willingly complies with the wishes of the Catholic princes. Mary is called Queen of England and France. Then the erection of the kingdom is granted at the request of King Philip and Queen Mary : it is not an act *motu proprio* of the Pope.

The erection of the kingdom of Ireland having been granted at the request of Philip and Mary, it is necessary to interpret the diploma according to the principles of Canon Law.

(a) Paul IV. does not at all mention the Bull of Adrian IV. If he admitted the genuineness of this Bull, he would naturally have recalled it, instead of referring vaguely to a time when the Kings of England had obtained the sovereignty of Ireland through the Holy See. I suspect that the Pontifical Court of 1555 had no knowledge whatever of the existence of such a Bull. It was only fifty years later that Baronius, meeting it by chance in Matthew Paris, inserted it in his Annals, showing at the same time how little he believed in its genuineness.

John XXII., it is true, spoke of the Bull of Adrian in a letter that he addressed to King Edward II., as I have said above. But it does not appear that this *secret* letter left any remembrance or trace in the Pontifical Court. In the time of Paul IV., the registers of John XXII. being still at the Pontifical Palace of Avignon, the Roman archivists could not know the particulars of secret documents that were not before their eyes.

With what object did John XXII. send to King Edward a copy of the Bull that he had received from the Irish of Ulster, if not to make known to this prince that he (the Pontiff) knew nothing about it, and that he doubted its genuineness? *Concessisse dicitur!* It may be that he was very glad to warn the King that the Pontifical Court would henceforth have an eye on the fraudulent methods that the English employed in order to gain the submission of the old Irish by a display of Apocryphal Bulls.

John XXII. did not care to keep a copy of the Bull of Adrian. Neither Bernard Guidonis nor Cardinal D'Aragon found a trace of it in the archives.

(b) The Bull of Paul IV. passed over in silence the agreement made in 1213 between Pope Innocent III. and King John. It is beyond doubt that the King offered the kingdom of Ireland to the Roman Church : *totum regnum Hiberniæ* ; but it seems no less certain that the Pope could not accept this donation. *Nemo dat quod non habet* is a maxim given us by the wisdom of nations. Now, King John, who possessed only a small part of Ireland, was not in a position to give the whole island : it is not permitted to perform good works with the property of others. Pope Innocent III., on his side, should not on any account take the sovereignty of a kingdom that did not exist. If he wished for sovereignty, he should begin by erecting the kingdom. We nowhere see that a Roman Pontiff conferred the investiture of Ireland on King John or any of his successors. This is why Paul IV. kept a prudent silence.

(c) Neither the Bull of Adrian nor the concordat of Innocent III. being able to serve as a title, it is not easy to see what led Paul IV. to say in his diploma that the Kings of England acquired the sovereignty of Ireland through the Holy See : *Illius dominium per sedem prædictam adepti sunt reges Angliæ*. But lo ! this incidental phrase gives rise to another difficulty. " Since the time when the Kings of England acquired the dominion of this island through the Apostolic See, they . . . have been accustomed to call themselves simply its Lords." How are we to know the precise time? King John, at the beginning of his reign, and even before it, took the pompous title of " Lord of Ireland." He could not rely on the false Bull of Adrian, which granted no right to the successors of King Henry II. It was Henry who, wishing to screen his son John from the nickname *Lackland* that had been given him and that remained with him, it was Henry who thought, by his own authority, to make John " Lord of Ireland." But the Popes gave John the mere title " Earl of Morton." After the death of Henry II., during the reign of Richard Cœur de Lion, Pope Clement III. having occasion to speak at the same time of Ireland and of John, gave the latter the

mere title of "Earl of Morton," as if he would not recognise that of "Lord of Ireland," so pretentiously assumed.

Thus, there is no historical connection between the taking of the title and any grant whatsoever of sovereignty in Ireland by the authority of the Holy See. All that can be said is that Pope Paul IV., or rather the writer of the Bull, copied from the petition of Philip and Mary. Only that, and nothing more.

(d) During a long time, it was inculcated upon the old Irish that they ought to regard the Pope as sovereign lord of the country. This notion was encouraged by Kings and Parliaments, as an easy means of securing submission. We may read on this subject the statutes of the Parliaments of the English colony, especially the seventh statute under Edward IV. (C. 9.)

Conformably to this notion, towards which the Irish showed themselves incredulous, but which the English spread with all their power, Philip and Mary represented to Paul IV. that the Kings of England had acquired the sovereignty of Ireland by a grant of the Holy See: *illius (insulæ) dominium per sedem prædictam (apostolicam) adepti sunt reges Angliæ*; but the assertion, exceedingly doubtful for eleven counties, seems entirely devoid of exactness and truth if we look at the twenty-one counties which held their independence, and which the English had never subdued. We may be permitted to doubt that Paul IV. would have consented to the erection of the kingdom, if he had been informed that the King of England possessed only the smaller portion of the island.

It is a fundamental principle of the Roman Chancery that grants on petition are pre-eminently conditional: they depend on the subjective and objective veracity of the representation: *si vera sint exposita; quatenus preces veritate nitantur*. When the foundation is defective, the building falls to the ground. The Bull of Paul IV. shows in every word that the erection of the kingdom of Ireland was decided on by the petition of Philip and Mary: ¹

¹ Philip and Mary, and Cardinal Pole, who was Mary's cousin, may all have believed *bona fide* in Adrian's grant, and thus led Pope Paul IV. astray by their representations or rather misrepresentations. For a Pope can err in matters of history just as in those of geometry or astronomy,

Philippo rege et Maria regina nobis super hoc humiliter supplicantibus. It is otherwise when the Pope declares that he acts spontaneously, or without request from any person.

(e) The Holy See always protects the rights of others. Paul IV. should protect them so much the more in the present case as the Irish had not been consulted on an affair that concerned them closely. This is why the Pope expressly safeguards the rights that any third party may set forth in regard to Ireland: *sine præjudicio iurium ipsius Romanæ Ecclesiæ, et cujuscumque alterius in illa (insula) vel ad illam jus habere prætendentis.* The consistorial decree makes the same reserve.

Remark carefully that the Bull does not reserve only the peaceable possession (*jus in re*), but it reserves also the future or the contested right (*jus ad rem*). Twenty-one independent counties peaceably possessed their territory: the Pope did not intend to modify at any cost their state. I ask if the old Irish had any right to claim back the territory of the English colony. Had not the invasion been unjust? Had not the conquest been accomplished by iniquitous means? Had the Irish acquiesced in their spoliation? This is the *jus ad rem*. I do not press the matter: it is enough to note that the Pontifical Bull reserves all rights.

It is very doubtful that the Irish would have consented to let themselves be included in a kingdom totally wanting in homogeneity, being composed of two disproportioned parts: on the one side, twenty-one independent counties, and on the other, eleven counties of an English colony, which depended on the Crown of England. For example, the republic of Cracow existed from 1815 to 1847; but no person had any idea of regarding it as part of the kingdom of Poland, which the Congress of Vienna gave to the Emperor of Russia.

(f) The Bull of Paul IV. did not confer on the King of England any new right over Ireland; in this respect, the situation continued the same as before. Investiture, dona-

It is only in matters of faith and morals that he is infallible, and even then, only when he speaks *ex cathedra*. As a private theologian, he may err.—*Trans.*

tion, concession—nothing of the kind is to be seen in the pontifical diploma. The independence of the old Irish therefore received no hurt.

By the erection of the kingdom of Ireland, Paul IV. conferred an honorary title on the King of England, who for a long time was called the King of France, although he had no authority in this latter country.

(g) I cannot say whether the Irish learned with satisfaction that their country had been raised to the rank of a kingdom. But I notice in McGeoghegan the following remarks :—“ To the month of June in this year (1555) we refer a Bull or Brief of Pope Paul IV., which conferred on Ireland the title of kingdom. We do not see very well the necessity for this new creation of the title of kingdom for Ireland. This island was adorned with that title a long time before the English were known there, and even before the institution of the Papacy.” (*Histoire d'Irlande*, t. 2, p. 367.)

Bzovius, after the Bull, gives some account of the private interview that Paul IV. had with the ambassadors of Queen Mary. After this, says the historian, the Pontiff complained that the ecclesiastical goods had not yet been restored. He said that the usurpers ought absolutely to be obliged to surrender them—that the English ought to be well convinced that sacrilegious thefts would draw down a curse from heaven on their families and on their kingdom. He recommended the ambassadors to write often to their princes on this point, and he renewed this advice on all occasions. He expressly ordered that they should engage them to re-establish Peter's Pence, because he had decided on sending a collector to England, according to custom. He had himself discharged this employment for three years, and he recalled to mind with pleasure the eagerness that the people, and even the poor, showed in paying this tribute. The English ought not to expect that St. Peter would open for them the gate of heaven, if they did not repair the injury that they had done him by usurping his rights.

The Earl of Sussex, Lord Lieutenant of Ireland during the reign of Mary, wrested from the old Irish the two districts of Offaly and Leix, and erected them into counties, which he called King's County and Queen's County, in

honour of Philip and Mary. This fact goes to show that, notwithstanding the erection of a new kingdom, the greater part of Ireland continued independent of the Crown of England.

The Parliament of the English colony re-established Catholic worship, acknowledged the authority of the Pope, and proclaimed the legitimacy of Queen Mary. (Statutes of Ireland under Philip and Mary, 1, 2, 3, 4.)

The Archbishop of Armagh resumed his See ; but married prelates and priests lost their benefices. Bayle, the Protestant Bishop of Ossory, who had so often put his life in danger by his violence and fanaticism, had the prudence to retire to the continent. The number of Protestants appeared too small to excite any fear, and their zeal was too prudent to cause any provocation.

Considering the state of poverty to which the Church was reduced, the Queen restored to it the ecclesiastical properties that, during the late reigns, had been annexed to the Crown. She had renounced the supremacy : could she retain the riches that came from an invasion of authority? With the approbation of Parliament, therefore, tithes, first-fruits, rectories, benefices united to the Crown since the twentieth year of Henry VIII., and producing a revenue of sixty thousand pounds sterling, were restored by the Queen, and placed at the disposal of the Bishops, who resumed the conferring of parishes and curacies. The monastery of the Knights of St. John of Jerusalem, that of the Benedictines at Westminster, and other religious houses were re-established.

CHAPTER XXIX.

CONFISCATION OF LANDS IN IRELAND.

IN 1560, under the reign of Elizabeth, the Protestant Parliament met in Dublin. It was decided that Ireland should be reformed according to the model of the Anglican Church ; but the nobility and the people detested this change, and the new laws were not enforced, except in places where they could be maintained by the bayonet.

Of all the native chiefs, the man who most alarmed the Government was Shane O'Neill, eldest son of the Earl of Tyrone. The old Irish respected and obeyed him as the chief man of the island. In 1565, he took part in some acts of open rebellion. Frequent losses obliged him to seek refuge among the Scotch of Ulster, enemies alike of Irish and English; and this Irish prince was basely murdered by his new friends, at the instigation of Pierse, an English officer. The name, as well as the title, of O'Neill was blotted out for ever by an Act of Parliament: to resume it was declared an act of high treason. The lands of Shane and his followers, comprising half of Ulster, were confiscated for the benefit of the Crown.

But this reduction of Ulster did not bring back peace. The restless feeling of the chiefs of the country, both Irish and English, continually drew them into local wars; and their attachment to the Catholic Faith made them enemies to the Government, which proscribed their religion. Insurrections broke out in all the provinces. The usual punishment was the confiscation of the lands of the delinquents; but it was easier to pronounce this punishment than to put it into execution.

A new plan was proposed to Queen Elizabeth—that of colonising the confiscated districts with English peasants, who, having an interest in the soil, would be obliged to combat the old Irish without expense to the Crown.

A trial of it was begun in 1572. Immense grants were made to some of the adventurers. The Earl of Essex offered to colonise with 1,200 men the district of Clannaboy, in Ulster. By a contract made between Elizabeth and him, it was agreed that the expense should be borne in equal portions by them.¹

This new plan of colonisation was regarded with horror by the natives both of Irish and English origin. They saw the fate that was in store for them. Several chiefs, either in person or by messenger, implored the help of Catholic powers for the defence of their property and their religion. The Kings of France and Spain were then engaged with matters of more immediate interest; but

¹ Every horseman who volunteered in the enterprise for two years was to obtain four hundred acres of land at two pence per acre, and every footman two hundred acres at the same rate.—*Trans.*

Gregory XIII. lent an ear to their complaints and their supplications. Ireland had not been named in the Bull of Saint Pius V. This omission was supplied for, and Gregory signed, but without publishing, a new Bull, by which he declared that Elizabeth had lost the Crown of Ireland, as well as that of England. (Becchetti, xii., § 21.)

In 1586, the Earl of Desmond was condemned by Parliament, and the lands of his earldom, consisting of about 600,000 acres, were confiscated to the Crown. These lands were granted to English colonists, and nearly all the favourites of Queen Elizabeth obtained extensive tracts, under condition of not admitting any person of Irish origin to dwell among them. Half the region lapsed into a wilderness. A considerable number of the old inhabitants rather than abandon their birth-place, consented to hold from strangers the lands that came to them from their ancestors.¹

¹ The following note is from the Introduction to a "Brief Description of Ireland, 1590," published by the Archæological Society, Dublin, 1841:—

"Her Majesty was bent on peopling Munster with English settlers, and letters were written to every county in England to encourage younger brothers to become 'undertakers' in Ireland, a name applied to the settlers on account of their being obliged to undertake to observe certain conditions enjoined by the Queen.

"The plan devised for the plantation of Munster was, to divide the forfeited lands into seignories; and to require each undertaker for 12,000 acres to plant eighty-six families upon his estate, viz.—

His own family to have	1,600 acres
One chief farmer	400 "
Two good farmers	600 "
Two other farmers	400 "
Fourteen free-holders, each 300 acres	4,200 "
Forty copy-holders, each 100 acres	4,000 "
Twenty-six cottagers and labourers	800 "
	<hr/>
	12,000 "

"And so proportionably for smaller seignories.

"The inducements to settle in Ireland were very great. The Queen proposed to give estates in fee, at two-pence per acre, in the counties of Cork and Waterford, to be rent free till March, 1590, and to pay but half the rent for the next three years. Thenceforth they were to hold in soccage; to have liberty for ten years to transport the growth of their lands, duty free, to any place in amity with England; to be free from cess for ever; to have liberty to import necessities from England, free of custom: and no Irish were to be permitted to reside on the lands; with several other covenants, some of which her Majesty did not

Catholic sentiment in Ireland felt a strong re-action against a Queen placed under sentence of excommunication and deposition. Some champions of independence appealed to the Sovereign Pontiff as their lord, not only spiritual, but temporal.

Dr. Lingard remarks that he does not know if this title was accepted or rejected. But the Popes often sent pecuniary, and sometimes military help, and exhorted the Irish to shake off the English yoke, and to free their country from civil and religious bondage. These exhortations had considerable influence on many persons, but the majority of the two races continued faithful to Elizabeth.¹ (*History of England, Reign of Elizabeth, Chapter VI.*)

Although Parliament had passed an Act to abolish Catholic worship in Ireland, it was not in the power of a

perform, particularly that of keeping troops for the security of the settlers in Munster."

The author of the book, one Robert Payne, encouraging Englishmen to come over to Ireland, says :—" Let not the reports of those that have spent all their own and what they could by any means get from others in England discourage you from Ireland, although they and such others by bad dealings have wrought a general discredit to Englishmen in that country which are to the Irish unknown. These men will say there is great danger in travelling the country, and much more to dwell or inhabit there; yet are they freed from three of the greatest dangers: first, they cannot meet in all that land any worse than themselves; secondly, they need not fear robbing, for that they have nothing to lose; lastly, they are not likely to run in debt, for that there is none will trust them. . . .

"33 herrings, 6 mackerel, 6 sea-breams, a fat hen, 30 eggs, a fat pig, one pound of butter, or 2 gallons of new milk, for a penny. A red deer without the skin, for 2s. 6d. . . . You may keep a better house in Ireland for £50 a year than in England for £200 a year."—*Trans.*

¹ This last remark, attributed to Dr. Lingard, appears to be an interpolation. I have searched through two editions of his *History of England* (Mawman, London, 1823, and Baldwin and Cradock, London, 1838), and can find nothing like it. On the contrary, I find him to say : "In Ireland almost the whole population, whether of English or Irish origin, was leagued in open or clandestine hostility against the English government."—"The O'Neill was celebrated in every district as the saviour of his country; and the whole of the indigenous population, and many of the chieftains of English origin, arose in arms to assert the independence of their country."

It is possible that a French edition may have been tampered with.

As a general rule, our learned author, who often quotes Dr. Lingard, is exceedingly correct in his views regarding Ireland, especially when we consider that he is a foreigner.—*Trans.*

handful of Protestants to deprive a whole people of their religious rites. If the laws were observed, it was only in the towns of the garrison. The news of Elizabeth's death was immediately followed by a restoration of the ancient worship.

The violent abolition of Catholic worship, and the fines inflicted on those who were absent from the Protestant Church on Sunday, were not the only blows of which the Catholics of Ireland had to complain. The law obliged every person to take the oath of supremacy, if he wished to practise at the bar, or to become a magistrate, or to obtain investiture or possession of feudal lands.

This law was often relaxed. Sometimes it seemed to fall into desuetude. But the Irish always knew that such favour came only from toleration, and that they were at the mercy of the Government, and of every perfidious or interested informer. During the greater part of the reign of James I. the laws were executed with some indulgence, but this indulgence was only accidental, and even when it took place, it did not proceed from any just idea of equity. It arose from a sense of weakness, and a conviction that the moment for another course was not yet come.¹

In 1605, James issued a proclamation, commanding all Catholic priests to quit Ireland under pain of death, and requiring the chief inhabitants to attend the Protestant service. Some great families of the country cried out against the unlawfulness of this ordinance, and asked that liberty of worship should be allowed them ; but the peti-

¹ A certain author, to whom we have several times referred, takes a mere passing remark from a letter (in *Spicil. Ossor.*, p. 113) which has no name attached, but was probably written by some Englishman or Anglo-Irishman in London to the Spanish ambassador there in 1604, and he presents it as the national sentiment of Ireland during the seventeenth century. It is to the effect that all the Catholics of Ireland believed the title by which the English Kings obtained the dominion of Ireland to be that the rights of the Church should be preserved whole and inviolate, according to the decree of Pope Adrian IV., as shown in some documents sent the previous year from England to be printed in Frankfurt. Now, who does not see that the nameless writer of this letter has no claim to be regarded as an exponent or a representative of the views held by the Old Irish? It was always the endeavour of the English to obtain belief for Adrian's Bull; but the Old Irish in general knew too well what to think of it. Their confidence in the Pope, their devotion to the Holy See, never failed for a single day. No doubt many of the Anglo-Irish followed their example.—*Trans.*

tioners were arrested, and lodged in the Castle. Many were banished out of the country.

By confiscating the property of fugitives, two million acres of land, forming nearly the whole of six counties in the North, fell to the Crown. James I. ordered a new trial of colonisation. Immense lots were reserved for the best known adventurers of England and Scotland, and for military and civil officers. Some of the smallest lots were given to native Irish ; but these were obliged to take the oath of supremacy, and to admit no tenant except of English origin. Such was the plan. Its execution, however, required many modifications. Of the whole region, in great part mountainous and uncultivated, a vast portion was never divided in any manner ; and many of the indigenous chiefs, either under pretext of loyalty or by means of gifts, had their old possessions yielded to them. Meanwhile, about a hundred thousand acres were colonised ; and the vigour of the measure, joined with the amalgamation of a new race, helped to keep in awe those turbulent spirits who had so often despised the authority and the power of the English Government.

Under the reign of Charles I., religious persecution became doubly intense.¹ The Irish then held a general

¹ Mr. Lecky, though no great friend of Ireland, felt himself bound as an honest historian to write thus of Ireland in the latter part of the sixteenth century :—

“ The slaughter of Irishmen was looked upon as literally the slaughter of wild beasts. Not only men, but even the women and children who fell into the hands of the English were deliberately and systematically butchered. The sword was not found efficient. But another method was found much more efficacious. Year after year, over a great part of all Ireland, all means of human subsistence was destroyed, no quarter was given to prisoners who surrendered, and the whole population was skilfully and steadily starved to death. The pictures of the condition of Ireland at this time are as terrible as anything in human history.”

We may indeed with all truth say, that during the last seven hundred years, Ireland has presented innumerable scenes for the proper description of which no historian can find words, no painter colours.

Again, speaking of the early part of the seventeenth century, Mr. Lecky says : “ It had become clear beyond all doubt to the native population that the old scheme of rooting them out from the soil was the settled policy of the Government ; that the land which remained to them was marked as a prey by hungry adventurers, by the refuse of the population of England and Scotland, by men

assembly. A national association was formed, and the members bound themselves by oath to maintain the free and public exercise of Catholic worship, and to claim for the people of Ireland the same privileges as were enjoyed by the people of England. All the Irish, with the exception of persons who lived in fortified places occupied by the English garrisons, consented to draw the sword against the common enemy of their rights and of their religion, and resolved never to lay down arms until they had obtained a recognition of the independence of the Irish Parliament, a removal of every degrading disqualification made on account of religion, and an exclusion of strangers from all civil and military charges in the kingdom.

The King signed a proclamation on the 1st of January, 1642, declaring that the insurgents were traitors, and again prohibited the exercise of Catholic worship.

Parliament borrowed a large sum of money on a pledge of the lands of the insurgents, which were regarded as already confiscated in consequence of the rebellion. For this design, two million five hundred thousand acres were set apart. These measures served to cement the union of the insurgents and to increase their efforts.

A council of Catholic prelates and theologians was convened at Kilkenny, on the 10th of May, 1642. A report of the grievances that had led the insurgents to take up arms was laid before them, and they decided that the reasons were sufficient, and that the war was lawful, provided that it was not carried on through motives of private interest or personal hatred, nor dishonoured by acts of needless cruelty. An oath was ordered to be taken, by which each man bound himself to protect, at the risk of his life and fortune, the

who cared no more for their rights and happiness than they did for the rights and happiness of the worms which were severed by their own spades."

While this sad state of affairs prevailed among the Irish, the English and Scotch settlers, favoured by the Government, were of course prospering in every way.

The President of the United States, Theodore Roosevelt, in a lecture on Cromwell, refers to the same period thus: "Ireland, utterly foreign in speech and culture, had been ground into the very dust by the crushing weight of England's overlordship." How admirable to see such sentiments of humanity in a man of such exalted and extensive influence!—*Trans.*

liberty of Catholic worship, and the lawful immunities and rights of the kingdom of Ireland, against all invaders or usurpers. Sentence of excommunication was also decreed against any Catholic who should abandon the union, and against any who should take advantage of the war to kill, wound, or rob another.

The republican Parliament of London had a design to exterminate the Catholic population. Cromwell, seeing the impossibility of effecting such a massacre,¹ had recourse to an expedient. This was to engage the chiefs to expatriate themselves, with great numbers of their fellow-countrymen, and to pass into the service of foreign powers. An Act of Parliament banished all Catholic officers. In this manner, the Irish population was lessened by thirty or forty thousand men able to bear arms. As for women and children, they were assembled in crowds of thousands, put on board of ships, and transported to America, especially to Jamaica.²

Notwithstanding all this emigration, and the frequent arrival of English and Scotch colonists, it was found that the Catholic population exceeded the Protestant in the proportion of eight to one.

A proclamation of the 6th of January, 1653, commanded all Catholic priests to leave Ireland within twenty days, under pain of being treated as guilty of high treason. Every person was forbidden to give shelter to any of the clergy, under pain of death.

A fine of half-a-crown was imposed on those who should fail to be present at the Sunday service of the Protestant Church. Magistrates were empowered to seize the children of Catholics, so as to have them brought up in England.

Some Priests who remained in the country were dis-

¹ Cromwell, after his barbarous massacres at Drogheda and Wexford, in which no mercy was shown to man, woman, or child, writes to the Parliament that it has "pleased God to give into your hands this other mercy, for which, as for all, we pray God may have all the glory." Drogheda was the first "mercy"; Wexford the second!

A more inhuman monster than Cromwell, always ready to call black white and white black, has seldom been seen. If sophistry were an honourable study, his writings might serve as a text-book for it.—*Trans.*

² For many interesting particulars of those cruel days, see *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, by Cardinal Moran. The poor Irish exiles were often sold as slaves for a very small sum.—*Trans.*

covered and hanged. Those who escaped search concealed themselves in the caves of mountains, or in lonely huts rudely built in the midst of bogs, from which they went forth at night, to carry the consolations of religion to the dwellings of their people.

A proclamation was also issued, ordering all Nuns to marry, or else to quit the island. Many of them were shipped to Belgium, France, and Spain, where they found hospitality in the convents of their Orders.

As a consequence of the confiscations made by Cromwell, and confirmed, at the time of the Restoration, by Charles II., the Irish lost the greatest part of their lands, for only a tenth part was left them.

The position of the indigenous Irish improved somewhat after the fall of the Stuarts. In 1691, freedom in the exercise of the Catholic religion, with a formal promise of protection from all trouble on account of it, was guaranteed to them by the Treaty of Limerick. It was stipulated that any Irishman might leave Ireland with his family and goods, and go to any country he pleased, except England or Scotland.²

CHAPTER XXX.

BRIEFS OF THE HOLY SEE ON THE WAR OF IRISH INDEPENDENCE.

SEVERAL briefs of Gregory XIII., and two other briefs by Clement VIII. twenty years later, approved of the rising of the Irish against the English, to recover the national independence, and freedom of worship for the Catholic religion.

¹ Even at the present day, it seems that three-fourths of the farms are crowded on one-fourth of the land.—*Trans.*

² If, at the time our esteemed author wrote, the *History of Ireland in the Eighteenth Century*, V. vols., by William E. H. Lecky, had been published, he would likely have had a great deal more to say on the reigns of William, Anne, and the Georges. The good clauses of the Treaty of Limerick held but for a very short time.

Abbé McGeoghegan shows from French official documents that between 1691 and 1745 more than 450,000 Irishmen died in the service of France alone, to say nothing of Spain or Austria. Life in Ireland had been rendered next to impossible for them.—*Trans.*

In point of fact, the champions of independence appealed to the Sovereign Pontiff, and the Popes often sent them pecuniary and military aid, and exhorted the Irish, by letters or by messengers, to shake off the English yoke, and to free their country from civil and religious bondage.

The brief of Gregory XIII. on the 13th of May, 1580, mentions another, anterior by a few years, which had likewise exhorted the Irish to take up arms for the defence of the Catholic Faith. The Pontiff granted the indulgences of the Crusades to all who should favour the good cause, by supplying either ammunition or food. The brief has been published by historians. It may be found in the *Histoire d'Irlande*, by McGeoghegan, with the following remark: "Behold the remedy that Gregory XIII. would bring to the evils of Ireland, which one of his predecessors, Adrian IV., had caused!" (T. 2, p. 1139.)

The first brief of Clement VIII. is dated the 16th of April, 1600. After the death of James Geraldine and his relatives, the army took as its leader Hugh O'Neill, Earl of Tyrone.¹ The Pontiff renewed the indulgences of the Crusades for men in the army, and for all others who should assist in the cause of independence and the defence of religion.

The Irish formed a national association against deserters from the Church. Clement VIII. highly approved of their zeal; recommended concord, a good understanding, to them; promised to write earnestly to Catholic princes; and announced the sending of a Nuncio, who would reside among them, and contribute to the maintenance of union. This brief, dated the 30th of January, 1601, was addressed to the Captain-General of the Catholic army.

In 1603, two cases of conscience were laid before the University of Salamanca. Prince Hugh O'Neill wages war against the Queen of England for the defence of the Catholic religion, that the Irish may be permitted to profess it—a liberty that the Queen wishes to take from them by force of arms. Can Irish Catholics in conscience, by arms and all other means, help Prince Hugh in this war? And can Irish Catholics, without mortal sin, enlist in the enemy's

¹ It will be observed, that, notwithstanding what has been said at p. 121, the name O'Neill still survives.—*Trans.*

army, fight against Prince Hugh, and favour the English by arms or in any other manner?

The Spanish Doctors answered the first question affirmatively, the second negatively.

The ~~resistance~~ of the Irish was just, because they defended religion, which the English endeavoured by force of arms to abolish. On the side of the Irish, it was a defensive war; they wished to preserve themselves from a religious persecution and a most tyrannical oppression. For the same reason, the war that the English made being unjust, an Irishman could not in conscience fight in their ranks, against his fellow-countrymen.¹

The Bull of Adrian IV. was never brought forward in the briefs that I have cited. Is it not truly significant that this Bull was never mentioned in any official document?

The Irish, bravely risen against England, earnestly desired that the Pope should take the temporal sovereignty of the kingdom, and be declared its lord and master. Peter Lombard, the representative of Hugh O'Neill with Clement VIII., believed in the genuineness of the Bull, as may be seen in the "Annals of Ireland," which he published at Louvain. Frequently admitted to a Pontifical audience, according to a promise given in the brief of 1601, he had many an opportunity of speaking of the Bull, and probably he urged the Pope to rely upon this ancient proof of pontifical right. But Clement VIII., resisting all importunity, took good care not to admit the genuineness of the Bull.

¹ Don Philip O'Sullivan, in his *Historiæ Catholicæ Hiberniæ Compendium*, has given much blame to some Anglo-Irish priests, who, through culpable or inculpable ignorance, taught a contrary doctrine:—"Cujus mali maxima culpa in aliquot Anglo-Ibernos sacerdotes jure transferenda est, qui tartareum dogma ab orco in Catholicorum perniciem emissum non negabant, licere Catholicis contra Catholicos et suam patriam pro hæreticis gerere arma, et dimicare. Quod si sacerdotes isti sanâ mente, et cum cæteris in hæreticis oppugandis unanimes et concordēs extitissent, et Iberni alii aliis non obstitissent, facili negotio potuissent hæreticorum jugum cervicibus discutere, ut ex omni nostra historia fusius et assertius constat." Edited by the Rev. Dr. Matthew Kelly, p. 339.—*Trans.*

CHAPTER XXXI.

EMANCIPATION OF THE IRISH.

TAUGHT by long experience that it was impossible to overcome the Irish in matters of religion, the English Government at last understood that it should grant Emancipation, with full religious liberty. But this great change was not wrought in a day ; the English yielded only little by little, and when compelled by necessity.¹

Since the conquest, Ireland had been subjected to iniquitous treatment. The conquerors began by despoiling the natives of a great part of their lands. The next step was, by ill treatment, to drive them into rebellion, so as to have a plausible pretext for depriving them of what was left.

Protestantism made no proselytes among the old Irish ; the only Irishmen who embraced it were the descendants of the English who settled in Ireland since the conquest. But, instead of allowing those men who had been so pitilessly robbed the exercise of the religion of their ancestors, the English banished the priests from their churches, and gave their goods to Protestants. Some Irishmen had still preserved lands ; their fidelity to the Stuarts served as a pretext for their spoliation. Cromwell first, and afterwards William III., greedily confiscated whatever had not been already confiscated, so that there remained in the hands of Catholics only a tenth part of the lands of Ireland.

To complete the evil, the new proprietors were not slow in returning to England—leaving their estates in the hands of middlemen, who sublet them in various portions to the unfortunate peasants at enormous rack-rents, and on conditions so hard that Russian serfs were less to be pitied.

In 1793, the English Parliament passed a Bill that freed

¹ Hence O'Connell's celebrated maxims, " England's difficulty is Ireland's opportunity," and, " We must take justice by instalments." These maxims were the practical application of the words of one of O'Connell's warmest friends and supporters, the Most Rev. Dr. Maginn, Bishop of Derry : " Ireland is our second mother ; her soil is sacred for us ; her honour, her glory, her independence should, after God and His holy faith, enlist all our sympathies, excite our warmest affection, and concentrate all our energies."—*Trans.*

the Catholics of Scotland from several disqualifications to which they had been subject. The Catholics of Ireland were likewise permitted by a Bill¹ to engage in civil and military employments, as also to exercise electoral rights. But many restrictions were imposed on them. They acquired civil rights, but they were denied political rights.

In 1798, an insurrection burst out in Ireland. It cost the lives of more than 30,000 men, and was the ruin of innumerable families. But it was well proved, by the acknowledgment of many leaders in it, that it had not at all for its original object the emancipation of Catholics. The chief insurgents wished only to found a republic on the ruins of the ancient government, and to be totally independent of Great Britain.

The union of the two Kingdoms and their Parliaments, which was effected in 1800,² did not modify the condition

¹ England had lately been taught a severe lesson by the withdrawal of the United States of America from their allegiance to her. She was also alarmed at the spread of republican principles in France, and feared an invasion of Ireland. She therefore believed it more for her interest to be less tyrannical.—*Trans.*

² For a very interesting account of Ireland's losses since the Union of 1800,—of which Union, Lord Clare, the son of an apostate lawyer, was said to be the Father—see *England's Wealth and Ireland's Poverty*, by Mr. Thomas Lough, M.P. The author shows that the gross income of Great Britain is reckoned at fifteen hundred and thirty millions, and that of Ireland at seventy millions. Then, deducting £12 per head for average support of population, the taxable income of Great Britain is about £30 a head, and that of Ireland £3 a head. If the Briton and the Irishman were to be taxed with equal fairness, each Briton should pay ten times as much as each Irishman. . . . In Great Britain the total taxation does not amount to quite one-ninth, in Ireland it amounts to four-fifths, of the taxable income. . . . The theory of the government of the two islands under one system is that like benefits should be enjoyed by both. Therefore, according to this theory, one-ninth of the taxable income is all that should be demanded in Ireland. "Let it not be said that this would be nothing for the people to pay. It would be just as much as the people now pay in Great Britain, and as much as they paid in Ireland when her own statesmen controlled the destinies of the country" (pp. 106, 107, 121). Elsewhere, he shows, that the taxation of Ireland ought to be reduced by about six millions a year (pp. 97, 98, 100).

Not long ago, Mr. John Redmond, M.P., in a very able speech, abounding with instructive statistics, spoke as follows:—"What a cruel thing it is that while every industry and interest in the country is neglected, while education is starved, while the labourers

of the Irish Catholics, who took no part in it, as they were excluded from political rights. It seems certain that Pitt had promised full Emancipation.

In 1829, troubles continued in Ireland, and as feelings grew more and more excited on each side, a civil war was to be feared. Emancipation became necessary: the demands of the Irish could no longer be resisted.¹

can get no justice, while the artisans of the towns cannot get decent habitations, while the drainage of Irish rivers is neglected, while the Irish railways are the worst and dearest in the world, and nothing is done to improve transit facilities, while the piers and harbours of the country are a disgrace and a danger to human life, and while all these things are so because of 'want of money'—what a scandal and a crime it is that all the while we are supporting the most expensive government in the world, and are paying from £3,000,000 to £5,000,000 a year more than our taxable capacity warrants as compared to Great Britain. Just think of how Ireland would be transformed if even a portion of this money of which we are annually robbed were spent under the paternal care of a native government upon some of these matters I have mentioned, instead of being squandered, as it is to-day."—*Trans.*

¹ The Irish were led on to this great victory by Daniel O'Connell, who was therefore called the "Irish Liberator." An ardent patriot, of giant mind and sympathetic heart, he laboured for many years to procure "Repeal of the Union." The pride of his countrymen, he was regarded as an uncrowned king, and was followed with unbounded confidence. He was a great advocate for moral force, though some people believe that moral force shows itself better by a well organised policy of passive resistance than by speeches in the House of Commons; and even the *Times* has admitted that passive resistance may become "more troublesome than armed rebellion." However, as far as can be judged at present, it seems a much wiser course for the Irish people to rally round their parliamentary representatives, and to pull well with them. It is to be feared that no other plan would work; and great disunion might be caused by advocating some crude scheme. After many a struggle for faith and fatherland, O'Connell died in 1847 at Genoa, on his way to the Eternal City, bequeathing "his soul to God, his heart to Rome, and his body to Ireland." He is buried in Glasnevin Cemetery (near Dublin), where a noble monument—a round tower 160 feet high, surmounted by a cross eight feet high—does honour to his memory. The chief street in Dublin, one of the finest in Europe, is called O'Connell Street, that his sentiments, his aspirations, and his lifelong endeavours may never be forgotten by Irishmen.

Thanks to Father Eugene O'Growney and the Gaelic League, a wonderfully strong national spirit, such as would have delighted O'Connell, has been awakened in the country during the past few years by the Irish Language Movement! Never, perhaps,

The Duke of Wellington proposed, and the two Houses of the English Parliament carried, a Bill which abolished civil distinctions, and recognised equality in political rights, with a few exceptions. Before being able to engage in public functions, Catholics should take an oath of fidelity to the Crown. It was forbidden them to display the insignia of their office or their rank in Catholic churches. Bishops could not bear the same titles as Bishops of the Protestant Church. Some precautions were taken against too great an increase of monastic bodies.

The Government made few friends for itself among the

did any movement take such a hold on the popular mind, or lead so directly to national life. "Our primary object," says Father O'Growney in the *Gaelic Journal*, "should be to make the Gaelic language live in the homes of the people." As a friend of his who knew him well informs us, he believed that if the Irish would not re-learn their language, and cultivate their own literature and art, they would wander farther and farther away from Irish thought and feeling, and at last forget that they had a country of their own to honour and defend. He believed that without Irish poetry, music, and story, they would never be themselves; would never listen to the voice of patriotism; would never make a step on the road to independence, but let their ancient land, in spite of all its glorious memories, sink to the level of a British province. He was deeply convinced that "native martial song is the Nurse of Freedom in every land beneath the sun." A man of great ideas and ideals, he did not decry the value of the English language, nor did he fail to see what a mighty bulwark the old language would be for the preservation of the old faith. His life, written by Miss Agnes O'Farrelly, M.A., is a work highly interesting.

In the coining of new Irish words, to meet modern requirements, it would seem better not to follow the example of the English, French, etc., who take Latin or Greek roots, but rather the example of the Germans, who try to find expressive terms in their own language. Thus, for magnanimity, they say *grossmuth*, great-spirit; for telescope, *fernrohr*, far-tube; for synonymous, *gleichbedeutend*, like-meaning; for transparent, *durchsichtig*, through-see-able; for to navigate, *schiffen*, to ship, or *segeln*, to sail; and for to demonstrate, *beweisen*, to make wise on—that is, to instruct. Still it must be admitted that they have adopted a good many other words which (though perhaps with a slight change of spelling) are now in general use everywhere; as *astronomie*, *telegraph*, etc. Occasionally the coined words seem rather far-fetched, as *anhang*, a hang-on, for appendix, and *thronhimmel*, a throne-heaven, for canopy. We also meet words of an originality that is amusing, as *handschuh*, a hand-shoe, for glove, and *schlaguhr*, a strike-hour, for clock. Sometimes, words very much alike have quite a different meaning, as *vorsehung*, foreseeing, providence, and *versehung*,

Catholics, who felt little gratitude for what the force of circumstances, rather than any sense of justice, had extorted. The Emancipation Bill placed the two countries on the same level, but it did not unite hearts.

The English Government did not grant Emancipation without first expressing its intention of making Irishmen disown and abjure the Bull of Adrian IV., and every other Bull that implied any right in the Pope to dispose of kingdoms or crowns. As a matter of fact, this question continually turned up in the long inquiries that preceded the Act of Emancipation. No one ever saw a contradiction

overlooking, mistaking. The prefixes *vor* and *ver* here correspond to *fore* and *over* in English.

It is to be hoped that with the spread of Irish literature, now so rapidly going on, a well-recognised standard, not only of style, but also of spelling and pronunciation, will soon be attained. Of course a great latitude must be allowed for variety of expression, without, however, letting it run wild. We should not forget what is often seen in history, that the dialects of people who once spoke the same language, have, by imperceptible changes and for want of pruning, at last become different languages, no longer intelligible to all.

About a century ago, the Welsh language was nearly extinct, but by a vigorous effort it was revived, and is now in a most flourishing condition. About three-fourths of the people of Wales use the Welsh language in the daily intercourse of life. There are large districts in which a word of English is never heard from January to December. In 1887, there were seventeen weekly newspapers in the Welsh language. The smallest circulation of any of these was 1,500, while the largest was returned at 23,000. Then there were monthly, bimonthly, and quarterly magazines, one of which had attained a circulation of 37,600. (These particulars are taken from the *Welsh Review*, quoted in the *Irish Gaelic Journal*, of June, 1892.) It was chiefly to the voluntary work, we are told, of untrained teachers for an hour in the Sunday Schools, that 999 out of every 1,000 Welshmen were able to read Welsh. About 1886 a "Society for the Utilization of the Welsh Language" was formed, and such has been its success that education in Wales is now thoroughly bilingual.

Large powers, as well as large sums of public money, have been granted to the school authorities in Wales. Books on every subject, and in every standard, may have Welsh and English readings side by side. Welsh headlines for copybooks, Welsh airs with Welsh words, Welsh history, etc., may be systematically taught. The annual Welsh Eisteddfod is an occasion of great national enthusiasm.

Other countries of Europe—Bohemia, Finland, Poland, Belgium—have saved their languages in like manner. But Irish is far more worthy of rescue and preservation than any of these. "Keltic

more palpable. For ages the English had relied on the false Bull of Adrian as the title-deed of their rights over Ireland; in 1829, they repudiated this title-deed, and any argument that might be brought forward to sustain it.¹

CHAPTER XXXII.

CRITICS.

APPROACHING the end of my work, I think it well to say something very briefly of the chief writers who have treated of the Bull of Adrian IV.

As outside of England the old chroniclers have not mentioned the Bull, I am led to believe that it was unknown on

dialects," says Dr. Jamieson, "seem to excel all others for philological and ethnological purposes." And Sir William Betham remarks: "The most ancient manuscripts in Europe are Irish." "Irish Gaelic," says the Very Rev. U. J. Bourke, "is for European savants a very ready, practical, and truthful vehicle for linguistic research in archaic fields of human speech and of history."

Father Bourke also remarks that, in his opinion, the following is the correct order and division of the Indo-European family of Aryan languages: 1, Sanscrit or Indian; 2, Zend or Persian; 3, Keltic or Irish-Gaelic; 4, Latin; 5, Greek; 6, Gothic or German; 7, Lithuanian; and 8, Sclavonian. (See *Aryan Origin of Gaelic Race and Language*, pp. 121, 154). Thus, Irish-Gaelic hold a very high and honourable place.

In some respects, Hungary may serve as a great example for Ireland. It is said that, within the memory of living men, Hungary had not five journals in which a word of the Hungarian language was used, and its annual revenue was under £6,000,000; whereas, at present, under a better regime, it has 800 newspapers and journals published in the Hungarian language, and its revenue is £42,000,000.—*Trans.*

¹ The Rev. P. Finlay, S.J., lately reviewing the position of Catholics in Ireland since the Emancipation, and urging the necessity of Catholic Associations such as exists with the best results in other countries, especially Germany and the United States of America, used the following weighty words:—"Look abroad—to the Catholics of the Continent, who have even harder struggles than our own, and read the lesson which they teach us. In Holland, Belgium, Germany, Catholics not only hold their own: they are advancing surely, peacefully, and vigorously along all the paths of civil progress. They have governed Belgium for the last twenty years; they control the government of Germany; they are fairly represented in the Ministry of Holland. They are organised and

the continent till about the beginning of the seventeenth century. Indeed, Saint Antoninus himself does not seem to have known it. He wrote a pretty long chapter on Adrian IV. He there cites the *Polycraticus* of Salisbury ; but he completely omits Chapter XLII. of the *Metalogicus*, which speaks of Ireland and the pretended donation. He selects from the *Polycraticus* the lamentations of Pope Adrian on the misfortunes of Popes : “ De quo Johannes Salesberiensis, qui erat ei multum familiaris, sic ait ; Audiavi papam Adrianum dicentem quod romano pontifice nemo est miserabilior ; conditione ejus nulla miserior.” (S. Antonin., *Pars Historialis*, tit. 17, c. 1, § 9.)

Here are the names of the writers of whom I am going to speak in the following sections : —

1. Cardinal Baronius, who although he seems to have had little belief in the genuineness of the Bull, inserted it in his Ecclesiastical Annals, and thus contributed to make it known.

united ; and so their claims are adjudged reasonable, or at any rate, resistless. And look at Italy, or worse still, at France—a vast Catholic majority, but without cohesion or force ; disunion, and, therefore, apathy or barren efforts ; place, power, patronage in the hands of the enemies of Catholicism, and persecution for the loyal children of the Church. If French and Italian Catholics would only look across their borders ; would sink their class and party differences, as German, Dutch, and Belgium Catholics have done ; would unite to combat energetically the socialistic and anti-Catholic minority, a short, though it might be a sharp, struggle would give them a complete victory.”

In connection with this subject, His Eminence Cardinal Logue speaks thus :—“ I have read Father Finlay’s Lecture on ‘ Catholics in Civil Life ’ with great interest and great pleasure. He puts the claims of Irish Catholics on their true basis with scientific precision. We seek no monopoly or ascendancy. We claim equality—fair play—even-handed justice—our share in the patronage and employments which are maintained, in great part, by our money. It is an undoubted fact that we are almost wholly excluded from these, and that our Faith is the chief disqualification. It appears to me an equally undoubted fact that we have the remedy in our own hands.”

All Catholics in Ireland who are entitled to vote on any occasion should take special care to see that they are not deprived of their rights through any negligence of their own or through some legal quibble. They should also examine the list of voters to see that none are enrolled there but such as are justly entitled to be so. All this is only to borrow a leaf from the book of their opponents, who are usually most vigilant on such matters.

Social life in Ireland, as elsewhere, has undergone wonderful

2. Bzovius, a Polish Dominican, Continuator of Baronius, picked up a most strange story, in such a manner as to surpass Cambrensis himself.

3. Bongars, in 1611, in *Gesta Dei per Francos*, published the letter of Adrian to Louis VII. Thirty years afterwards, André Duchesne re-edited this letter (t. 4, *Rerum Francicarum Scriptores*.)

4. Lynch, an Irish priest, published in 1662 the celebrated work *Cambrensis Eversus*, in which he directly attacks the genuineness of the Bull.

5. About 1692, Colonel Charles O'Kelly, in the *Excidium Macariæ*, followed the general sentiment. A man of the sword, he could not easily become a scholar by profession.

6. Antony Pagi, instead of imitating the circumspection of Baronius, thought that Raoul de Diceto, Giraldus Cambrensis, and Matthew Paris left no room to doubt of the

changes during the last hundred years. We have been assured by a native of Cork that in that city, about the early part of the nineteenth century, it was no uncommon thing to see a business establishment closed up, and a large placard "Gone to Dublin" pasted on the shutters—so that customers might be on the lookout for the return of the proprietor with a new supply of goods, and doubtless a good supply of news. How different from the present day, when we can stay at home, and, by means of a gramophone, listen to the magnificent singing of a full Gregorian Choir at a Pontifical High Mass in St. Peter's, Rome!

The great consolation of the Irish people during their centuries of suffering was their religion. They regarded faith as a precious treasure; it was their chief, often their only, comfort in life and in death. Overwhelmed with misfortunes, and even famine-stricken, they held fast to it. It is said that in the eighteenth century immense numbers of the people went barefoot, not being able to buy shoes. But let us remember that poverty is not inconsistent with sanctity. Lazarus, whose sores were licked by dogs, the angels thought it an honour to carry to the Bosom of Abraham. Multitudes of hermits in the deserts of Egypt and Palestine seemed in want of all things, and yet added to their pains by letting themselves be stung by mosquitoes. But the greatest example of poverty and sanctity combined in modern times is surely that of St. Benedict Joseph Labrè. The strange manner of life that he adopted was of his own choice, not of necessity—his parents being in good circumstances, and himself the eldest son—and so far was he from being an ignorant man, that he spoke Latin fluently. For his food he was content with orange peel, cabbage stalks and leaves, withered and rotten fruit,

genuineness of the Bull. Francis Pagi copied from his uncle.

7. In *l'Histoire d'Irlande*, published in French at Paris in 1758, and dedicated to the Irish Brigades in the service of France, McGeoghegan made some judicious observations that deserve to be known. Without absolutely denying the genuineness of the Bull, he skilfully pleads that it was surreptitiously or obreptitiously obtained.

8. Dr. Lingard abstained from directly touching the question. However, he says enough to let us see that he had little faith in the genuineness of the Bull.

9. In our days, Mr. John Cornelius O'Callaghan has discussed the Bull of Adrian, first in notes to the *Macariae Excidium*, published at Dublin in 1850 (p. 242-259). Twenty-two years afterwards, he again came forward with a summary of his assertions in a newspaper called the *Irishman*, June, 1872. Mr. O'Callaghan believed in good faith that his reasons were unanswerable.

etc., thrown out of doors and windows, and lying on the streets. He never asked alms. If it were offered him, he took only what he needed for one day. If he met with neither food nor alms, he went out into the country, ate grass, and drank water. His hair and beard were quite neglected; perhaps at Christmas he had himself shaved. He usually slept in the open air. His ragged clothes, the same in winter and summer, swarmed with vermin, which gnawed him day and night. The endurance of this loathsome pain, an excruciating torment, was his greatest penance. Yet his countenance always bore a serene look. No article of his clothing was ever changed till worn out; or even washed. He made no vows. Prayer was his continual occupation. A most holy man, he never lost his baptismal innocence; he held the slightest sin in the utmost abhorrence. But as for sanitary laws, he did not regard them as essential to the practice of virtue. Thus in Ireland it is often found, especially in houses where the Rosary is said at night, or in localities where good schools exist, that children, even though very poor, grow up like the purest lilies, notwithstanding the dangers that surround them. And does not the wonderful example of Pope Adrian IV. show what a poor boy, with good dispositions, may come to? Many of the actions of St. Benedict Joseph are only to be admired, not imitated, by people in general, whose duties require a different conduct. If the managers of any institution allowed the inmates thereof to swarm with vermin, or encouraged disease by a neglect of the laws of health, how quickly and how justly would they be condemned! In like manner, the dwellings of the poor ought to be improved in many ways. With St. Bernard we advocate cleanliness, which we believe to be akin to godliness. Our churches, convents, hospitals, orphanages, etc., are usually

10. In reply to the aforesaid article, the Most Rev. Dr. Moran, Bishop of Ossory, published in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* the memoir of which I have already spoken—a substantial work, full of new and judicious remarks, eminently calculated to raise the best founded suspicions against the Bull.

SECTION I.—BARONIUS.

The letter of Pope Adrian IV. to King Louis VII. appears to have been unknown in the time of Baronius. The learned annalist never speaks of it. The oldest edition that I know is of the year 1611. If Baronius had known it, his sagacity would probably have been awakened to make him examine directly the question of the genuineness of the Bull.

Roger de Hoveden, Gervase, and William of Newbridge, are the sources from which Baronius draws. He nowhere

models of neatness and tidiness. "Order is Heaven's first law." But from the example of St. Benedict Joseph Labrè, who is now honoured on the altars of the Universal Church, we learn that poor people, strangers to the refinements of life, may be great friends of God, and worthy of our deepest respect.

Some people in this country have a great deal of fault to find with Irish Catholics for building expensive churches. They can point specially to the Cathedral of Armagh, which has cost £250,000—though most of this money came from other lands. These wiseacres, who hold so much property that once belonged to Irish Catholics, regard such magnificent churches as suited only for the rich. But let us hear how His Eminence Cardinal Moran, in a recent number of the *Australasian Catholic Record* (Jan. 1905), refers to them. "These would-be critics," he says, "forget that Catholic Churches are the House of God and the home of the poor. There is perfect equality of rich and poor in the presence of the Altar of God. The poorest old apple-woman may enter the cathedral in her rags with as much confidence, and as much sense of ownership, as the richest nobleman in the land. Nothing can exercise a more ennobling, and elevating, and purifying influence on a religious people than such beautiful edifices erected to the glory of the Most High."

A Parish Priest, to whom the care of souls is committed, may sometimes help much towards the bodily health of his parishioners, and thus imitate our Divine Master, who "went about doing good." With a knowledge of hygiene, he may, for example, caution them against the dangers of breathing bad air, drinking infected water, etc. Many simple points regarding air, food, mastication, white-

quotes Giraldus Cambrensis, or Matthew Paris, though of the latter he found a manuscript in the Vatican.

At the year 1155, Baronius gives a long extract from the *Polycraticus*, relating to the conversations of Salisbury with Pope Adrian. On the other hand, the annalist passes over in silence the *Metalogicus*, with its false donation of Ireland.

Coming to the year 1156, he relates, according to William of Newbridge, the submission of the Welsh, who were subdued by Henry II.

At 1158, Baronius relates, as done by Gervase, the reconciliation of Louis VII. with Henry II., the journey of the latter to Paris, the festivities in consequence, the marriage of their children, and other particulars. If the annalist had had the letter of Adrian before his eyes, his perspicacity would likely have led him to discover the

washing, etc., are often overlooked by poor people. What a consolation for him it will sometimes be to reflect that by his warnings he has averted a serious epidemic, which might have proved fatal to the lives of many! In the building of churches, schools, etc., he will see that there is no forgetfulness of sanitary principles. He will also be mindful of the dangers of consanguinity, since, according to recent statistics, sixty-seven per cent. of sick or deformed children come from the marriages of first cousins, and the dreadful percentage of ninety-six from the marriages of double cousins. It is quite certain that many evils, physical as well as moral, arise from preventible causes. How prudent therefore to anticipate them in time!

As regards moral evils, it need only be remarked that, since the establishment of Industrial Schools in Ireland, nearly half the gaols of the country have been closed. This fact alone shows how much depends on the instruction and training of youth, the latter being a very necessary supplement to the former. Indeed it is the opinion of many that the most important part of a child's education is completed before its sixth year; because at that age, even though the use of reason has not been attained, the mind has taken a particular *set*, from which it cannot afterwards be removed without difficulty. Of course a highly important part of education remains to be accomplished in the years that follow. (See Lehmkuhl, *Theol. Moral.*, vol. i., numbers 789, 786.)

It is said that in Belgium many priests take a most active part in founding and directing co-operative and other societies among the peasantry. In some, perhaps all, of the dioceses there is a priest specially appointed for social work of this kind, just as a catechist is for religious instruction. (See *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, June, 1905, p. 504).—*Trans.*

object of this alliance ; for the letter says clearly that the two princes wished to undertake together an expedition into another country, which could be no other than Ireland.

After noting the death of Adrian IV. in 1159, Baronius gives a long biography of the Pope from an old manuscript in the Vatican. There is not a single word in it about Ireland, or a donation that the Pope made to the King of England.

It is only after all this that the annalist ends by saying that, not to forget anything connected with the memory of so great a Pontiff, he is going to copy from a Vatican manuscript (this is the chronicle of Matthew Paris) a diploma given to Henry, King of England, with a view to re-establish in better form the affairs of religion in Ireland ; but in what year the diploma was given is uncertain.

It seems to me that Baronius could not have shown more clearly the doubts that he entertained regarding the genuineness of the Bull. An historian does not express himself in this loose manner regarding a document that he believes to be certain. While declaring the uncertainty of the date, the annalist gives the lie again to the *Metalogicus*, as well as to the chroniclers who attach the Bull to the year 1155, or to the sojourn of John of Salisbury at Beneventum.

In the memoir that appeared in 1872, Dr. Moran expresses himself thus :—" In the present instance we are not left in doubt as to the source whence Baronius derived his information regarding Adrian's supposed Bull. During my stay in Rome I took occasion to inquire whether the MSS. of the eminent annalist, which are happily preserved, indicated the special ' Vatican Manuscript ' referred to in his printed text, and I was informed by the learned archivist of the Vatican, Monsignor Theiner . . . that the *Codex Vaticanus* referred to is a MS. copy of the History of Matthew Paris, which is preserved in the Vatican Library. Thus it is the testimony of Matthew Paris alone that here confronts us in the pages of Baronius ; and no new argument can be taken from the words of the eminent annalist. Relying on the same high authority, I am happy to state that nowhere in the private archives or among the private papers of the Vatican, or in the

Regesta . . . or in the various indices of the Pontifical Letters, can a single trace be found of the supposed Bulls of Adrian IV. and Alexander III."

SECTION 2.—BZOVIVS.

Called to Rome, under Paul V., the Polish Dominican ransacked the archives of the Vatican, and published various works, among which we find an ecclesiastical history, in two volumes folio, an abridgment of the twelve volumes of Baronius ; also, a continuation of the annals of the learned Cardinal, from 1198 to 1565, in eight volumes. The first volume, dedicated to Paul V., saw the light in 1615.

Although Baronius had given the Bull of Adrian IV., as I have said above, Bzovius, in his ecclesiastical history, does not say a word of it. He cites, however, John of Salistury, and gives three passages from the *Polycraticus*, but he passes over in complete silence the *Metalogicus* and the donation of Ireland.

At 1171, he cites Hoveden on the pretended submission of the Irish Bishops to King Henry II.

At the year 1172, he relates the oath that Henry II. swore in the cathedral of Avranches. The clause relating to the feudal subjection of England is in the same terms as in Baronius.

He adds a point which shows that the letter of Adrian to Louis VII. could refer only to Ireland. According to the historian, the two Cardinals, occupied with the rehabilitation of Henry II., required from him a promise to go into Spain, if necessary, and the Pope should wish it : " Si necesse fuerit, et dominus papa ei mandaverit, ibit in Hispaniam, ad liberandam terram illam a paganis." It is incredible that, a few years previously, Pope Adrian had dissuaded the same Henry II. and Louis VII. from making an expedition into Spain. (*Historia Ecclesiastica*, t. 2, p. 331, 332, 353, 354.)

I turn to the Annals of the same author. At the year 1321, he gives the letter of John XXII. to King Edward without date, and without name of place from which it was written. He prints this letter again in Vol. XX. of the Annals, 1542, No. 12. This time he dates it from the

tenth year of John XXII., but he omits the preamble. It is here that we read his extraordinary story, truly unworthy of a grave historian :—

“ About the year 1160,¹ the Chair of Peter being occupied by Adrian IV., an Englishman by birth, who, before his Pontificate, had, by his sanctity and preaching, converted the kingdoms of Norway and Sweden to the Faith of Christ, the Irish, who, in the beginning, immediately after receiving the Christian religion, had given themselves and all they possessed into the dominion of the Roman Pontiff, and from that time had recognised no other supreme prince than the Roman Pontiff alone, seeing themselves greatly afflicted by the intestine wars of a multitude of petty kings and tyrants, some among them and a great part of the people, in order to enjoy peace, and lest they should be subjugated by others, desired to submit themselves to Henry II., King of England (under whom St. Thomas of Canterbury afterwards suffered martyrdom, and who was at this very time in Ireland with a great army). This is the reason why they humbly asked Pope Adrian, in the name of the two parties, viz., the king on one side, and the princes and bishops of Ireland on the other, that, in order to put an end to the quarrels and seditions almost continual that arose from the multitude of petty rulers, and also to regulate better the worship of the Catholic religion, which had been much impaired by the frequency of wars, especially as regarded the celebration and observance of marriages, his Holiness would vouchsafe to grant the dominion of all Ireland to King Henry, who had already acquired some places in the island by his own arms and those of his friends, namely, Robert FitzStephen and Richard Earl Pembroke, the Pontiff, for these and other causes, whether because he derived no profit from Ireland, or because he could not without great expense send help to a kingdom so remote, yielded with little difficulty ; but prescribing certain conditions by which the said Henry and his descendants would hold the kingdom, and acknowledge that it had been given by the Apostolic See. When King Henry, and the Irish princes and people, had bound themselves by oath to these conditions in two councils, one held at Dublin and the other at Cashel, the King

¹ Adrian died the previous year, 1159.

of England was declared by apostolic authority Lord of Ireland."

Bzovius does not tell us the source of his information. I consider it needless to point out the anachronisms and the discrepancies of the story.

SECTION 3.—BONGARS AND DUCHESNE.

James Bongars, a Calvinist, councillor and steward of Henry IV., born at Orleans in 1546, was employed by this prince at the Courts of Germany, as resident ambassador. He died at Paris in 1612, the year that followed the publication of *Gesta Dei per Francos*. He had acquired a great part of the manuscripts of St. Benedict's on the Loire, scattered about after the pillage of this abbey by the Calvinists. He also purchased many manuscripts of the library of the Cathedral of Strasburg.

The letter of Pope Adrian to Louis VII. appears in *Gesta Dei per Francos*. (Page 1174, Hanoviæ, 1611.)

It is the twenty-eighth of the letters written to Louis VII. by kings, princes, and prelates. Twenty-seven were borrowed from the library of President Petau, but of the twenty-eighth, that of Pope Adrian, Bongars does not mention the source. Thus we read in the preface:—"Epistolæ a regibus, principibus, prælatibus, ad regem Francorum Ludovicum Juniozem, viginti septem. Ex bibliotheca P. Petavii." I suspect that all these letters came from the Abbey of St. Benedict on the Loire. Probably they were given by Bongars to Petau, except the letter of Adrian, which he preserved, and which did not enter the President's library until after the writer's death.

Thirty years later, Andrew Duchesne found these same letters in the hands of Alexander Petau, senator, or councillor in the Parliament of Paris. They appeared in Volume IV. of *Rerum Francicarum Scriptores*, published after the death of the editor, in 1641.

We are told that the manuscript of these letters was old:—"Epistolarum volumen, quas Pontifices Romani . . . ad Ludovicum VII. scripserunt. Ex veteri codice MSS. viri clar. Alexandri Petavii senatoris Parisiensis nunc primum editum, 1641." The volume appeared after the death of Andrew Duchesne, as I have said. This

learned man could hardly have been unaware that Bongars had published the letters.

The Abbey of St. Victor in Paris possessed another manuscript of the letters in question. The editor of Duchesne admits it :—"Fuit et simile olim exemplar in bibliotheca Canonorum Regularium Sancti Victoris Paris, not. II., 22, cum sequenti inscriptione.—Plures epistolæ Summorum Pontificum Adriani IV. et Alexandri III., &c. Inter quas multæ habentur concernentes statum hujus ecclesiæ Sancti Victoris sub primis abbatibus nostris.—Unde conjici facile potest hanc epistolarum collectionem ab aliquo monasterii Sancti Victoris abbate, vel canonico, fuisse factum." (*Rerum Francicarum*, t. iv., p. 557.)

The manuscripts of President Petau were purchased for their weight in gold for Christina of Sweden, who left them to the Vatican Library, in which they form the chief collection of the Queen.

Bongars, first of all, arbitrarily interpreted of Spain the initial letter H. of the manuscript. By this mistake, more or less intentional, he led editors and historians astray.

It is natural to inquire if Bongars, a Calvinist, had any interest in leaving the literary world ignorant of the fact that Pope Adrian, far from authorising a conquest of Ireland, had, on the contrary, formally dissuaded the King of France and the King of England from attempting it, and positively refused his concurrence in the expedition. It seems to me clear that the publication of the letter in the year 1611 would have seriously thwarted the designs of England over Ireland.

Could a Calvinist point out the way to justify a Pope from an accusation specially odious, which, during so many ages, had sullied the memory of this Pontiff?¹

¹ After reading the above remarks, which help to solve a serious difficulty (namely, the frequent mention of Spain), the following remarks from a supporter of Adrian's Bull will not appear very ingenuous, but rather very misleading :—"The letter of Adrian was printed for the first time from an original manuscript in the year 1611 by Bongars, and while Spain is the country mentioned, not a word about Ireland. About thirty years afterwards it was published from another manuscript by Duchesne, and of Spain alone mention is made. Every subsequent historian, from Bouquet to Natalis Alexander, mentions Spain as the country in question."

Not the slightest allusion here to the letter H, by which the reader might form a correct idea of what actually occurred.—*Trans.*

Unless I am greatly mistaken, I have shown as clear as noon-day that the letter of Adrian to Louis VII. cannot refer to Spain, and that it must refer to Ireland. (Chapters VI. and VII.)

Had the King of France any need of the Pope's permission to aid the King of Castile, who was his father-in-law?

What interest could induce Henry II. to wage war in Spain?¹ He was so little disposed to it by nature, that the Cardinal Legates made it a condition of his absolution, at the time of the Avranches Conference.

If there was question of Spain, was it an Englishman, Rotrodus of Warwick, who would be chosen to negotiate the affair at Rome?

And the clergy, the princes, the people, who ought to be consulted—who had a right to interfere—could all that refer to Mussulman Spain?

It seems to me certain that King Henry II., not daring to come forward openly, got Louis VII. to ask Pope Adrian for permission to attempt the conquest of Ireland, but that the Pope absolutely refused any such permission. Therefore, it is not possible that this same Pope issued the supposed Bull—a Bull, moreover, that neither Bongars nor Duchesne found anywhere among their manuscripts of the twelfth century.

SECTION 4.—LYNCH.

The arguments of Lynch against the Bull have so much the more weight as he was not by any means a man of unreasonable or untractable disposition. Moderate by character, he took his place among those Irishmen who approved of the treaty for one year's suspension of arms concluded with the Marquis of Ormond.² He passed into

¹ This is a point which perhaps is worthy of more consideration than it usually receives. What motive could induce Henry to undertake a costly expedition to Spain, for the purpose of maintaining the liberties of the Church there, while he attacked them at home? Would not Ireland, by its proximity, offer a better field for plunder and conquest to a rapacious monarch?—*Trans.*

² It is to be hoped that the day will soon come when the character of the Papal Envoy, the illustrious Archbishop Rinuccini, and also that of the brave commander, the noble-minded Owen Roe O'Neill, which suffered so much at this sad period, will be

France in 1652, when Galway was taken by the troops of Cromwell. During his abode in France, he still devoted himself to the interests of Ireland.

It was probably in France that he published *Cambrensis Eversus*: the work bears no name of printer or place. The writer conceals himself under the pseudonym of *Gratianus Lucius Hibernicus*. This work has become exceedingly rare: we are told that a multitude of copies perished in a fire at London. It is a folio of 356 pages.

The work was reprinted between 1848 and 1852, in three volumes octavo, under the care of the Rev. Matthew Kelly, for the "Celtic Society." This edition is not in stock with booksellers.¹

In 1659, Richard Ferral, an Irish Capuchin, presented a memoir to the Cardinals of the Propaganda, under the

thoroughly vindicated. Many works have lately appeared that throw a flood of light on the events of the seventeenth century. See, for example, *Spicilegium Ossoriense*, by Cardinal Moran; *The Confederate Wars*, by Sir John Gilbert; *The Chances of War*, an historical tale, by the Rev. T. A. Finlay, S.J. Also several works mentioned by the *Dublin Review*, when treating of these matters. (March, 1845 and April, 1874). It should be remembered that when calumnies have once gained ground, they are not easily displaced. Moreover, the books in which Catholic writers might hope to find a true account of events were often so rare and expensive as to be beyond their reach. Thus, so late as in 1844, with all our advances in printing, Burke's *Hibernia Dominicana*, even without the supplement, was selling for five or six guineas; Lombard's *Commentarius de Rebus Hiberniæ*, seven guineas; and O'Sullivan Beare's *Historia Catholica Compendium* (a small quarto), seventeen guineas. *Dublin Review*, first series, xvi., 520.—*Trans*

¹ As the three letters (see p. 32) attributed to Pope Alexander III., and first published in 1728 by Thomas Hearne, sub-librarian of the University, Oxford, were generally unknown in the time of Dr. Lynch, it was impossible for him to make any comments on them. Abbé McGeoghegan, who wrote some thirty years after Hearne, seems never to have heard of them. In this connection, it is well to remember that when John of Salisbury was at Beneventum (see p. 48), Cardinal Roland, who afterwards became Pope Alexander III., was also there, as one of the Papal Court (see p. 63, note). We cannot suppose that any important grant regarding Ireland was made by Pope Adrian IV. through John of Salisbury, without the Cardinal's signing a document in reference to it, or at least knowing all about it. Yet John in writing afterwards to Pope Alexander III. never asked a confirmation of it, or made any more allusion to it than if it never

title : *Autores et modus eversionis catholicæ religionis in Hibernia*, &c. Convinced that the memoir of the Capuchir could only increase the troubles of Ireland, by sowing divisions between the old Irish and those of English origin, Lynch opposed it, and published in 1664 his *Alithinologia*, &c. It is a quarto of 82 leaves. A supplement of 137 leaves appeared in 1667. These two works, still more rare than *Cambrensis Eversus*, are much sought for, and reach very high prices at public sales.

In 1669, Lynch brought out at St. Malo his *Pii antistitis Icon, sive de vita et morte P. Francisci Kirovani Alladensis episcopi, autore Joanne Lynchæo, archidiacono Tuamensi*. It is an octavo of 72 leaves.

Nicholson, in his "Irish Library," says that he has seen a manuscript work from the hand of Lynch himself, a collection of some of the most authentic annals of Ireland. It is, he says, a work as complete as it is exact and interesting. This author also speaks of a letter of Lynch to Bayle, in order to prove that the Scots who first taught in the universities of Paris and Oxford were Scots of Ireland. Finally, he assures us that Lynch was promoted to the Bishopric of Killala, in Ireland, a short time before his death, which occurred about the year 1680.

It is worthy of remark that a writer so enlightened as Lynch should have boldly pronounced against the genuineness of the Bull of Adrian.

About the same time appeared at Liege the "Ecclesiastical Annals" of Alford, who also raises doubts on the

existed (see p. 51, n.). He could say enough of minor affairs, and could he say nothing of a matter of the utmost gravity? Moreover, in the three letters mentioned above, Pope Alexander III. shows no knowledge whatever of any such grant made by his predecessor (see p. 33); and in the other letter attributed to Alexander III. (see p. 64) he shows a total misconception regarding the nature of the said grant, as explained in the Bull attributed to Pope Adrian IV. Passing over the last-mentioned letter, of which Giraldus himself makes little account, is it easy to believe that the other three letters are authentic? It may be objected that Cardinal Moran believes them to be so. We can only say in reply that his Eminence gives no reason for so doing, and we are therefore unable to consider on what grounds he proceeds. We do not know how anything in the book brought to light by Hearne can be proved to be authentic. We rather think that an old book of this kind—probably compiled by an enemy of Ireland—deserves to be regarded with suspicion.—*Trans.*

Bull. Alford was born in London in 1582. Having retired to Lancashire, he collected materials for his Annals. He passed over to the continent in 1658, and died the same year at St. Omer. His work appeared five years afterwards, at Liege, in four volumes. Alford was not acquainted with *Cambrensis Eversus*. The two writers agreed without knowing it.

It was the silence of the old chroniclers that raised doubts in the mind of Alford regarding the Bull. "Neither Matthew Paris," he says, "nor any one else of the old historians of England, speaks of it." Alford was mistaken as far as concerns Matthew Paris; but it is quite true that Roger de Hoveden, William of Newbridge, and, generally speaking, the chroniclers of the twelfth century, make no mention of the Apocryphal Bull. (See Chap. XXII., above.)

SECTION 5.—MACARIÆ EXCIDIUM.

(1692.)

This work contains a history of Ireland under fictitious names. Macaria or Cyprus is nothing but Ireland. The English are called Cilicians. The high-priest of Delphos is the Pope. Colonel Charles O'Kelly surrounded himself with mystery, chiefly on account of the part that he had taken in the Irish Revolution. A Latin translation was made in the last century by a Catholic priest, who took the pseudonym of *Gratianus Regallus*. A volume containing both Latin and English texts, was brought out in Dublin in 1850, under the care of Mr. John C. O'Callaghan, as I have said above.

I must confine myself to what regards the Bull of Adrian; and, in order to be more clear, I shall replace the pseudonyms by the real names.

"But never yet was kingdom placed on such a sure foundation that it did not ultimately arrive at the limit of its existence; and the Irish empire, which had endured more than 2,000 years, at length yielding to the decrees of fate, had to recognise this immutable law, to which all human powers are subject. Henry, the second of the name, King of England, had promised his assistance to Dermot, the suppliant prince of Leinster, whom the King of Ireland

had exiled, for carrying away the wife of another provincial prince. The English leaders, whom Henry II. had sent over with a well-appointed fleet, to re-instate Dermot, forcibly possessed themselves of a large portion of Leinster, and, having expelled the inhabitants, divided their lands among the English adventurers. Nor do I know that it had ever previously occurred that one nation, professing the Catholic faith, should usurp the dominion over another nation of the same religion, and extirpate and expel its inhabitants from their native soil; it being in that creed expressly forbidden, and counted an especial sin, to covet the goods of one's neighbour; and, at that time, not the English and Irish only, but almost all the nations of Europe, were religious observers of the Roman Catholic rites. A success, so fully in accordance with the wishes of Henry II., led him to carry out a plan he had long meditated; for he had long since anxiously considered how he might subdue Ireland, and extend his English empire by such an accession of territory. For this purpose, he forged (unless, haply, it was genuine) a Bull of the Pope of Rome, which, he pretended, granted him the dominion of Ireland, on the condition of his becoming the patron of the priesthood, and restoring, in their ancient splendour, the ruined temples and neglected altars of the heavenly powers, in accordance with Catholic rites.

"The Pope claimed this right over Ireland, in virtue of a grant made to him by Constantine, the first emperor of the Romans who embraced the Catholic faith, who, he stated, had conveyed to him and his successors the dominion of all the islands which lay scattered amidst the recesses of the Mediterranean Sea. Oh, vain invention of an ambitious Sovereign!—for the annals of all nations, and the monuments of every age, bear testimony the most eloquent, that Ireland never was under the sway of the Roman Empire, and therefore its Emperor had no power to grant to another a right which he never had himself possessed. Nor, at that time, was there in all the globe, not even in Rome itself, a spot where the heavenly powers were more religiously adored, and the Catholic rites more sincerely celebrated, than in the island of Ireland.

"Now, when Henry II. approached the shores of Ireland with a mighty host, levied in every quarter, rumour greatly magnified his numbers, and the lesser princes, in-

timidated, and more particularly afraid of opposing the Pope, whom they venerated as a second Deity, made their submission to him at Dublin. Roderic O'Connor, however, who was then chief King of the whole island, relying on the position and natural strength of Connaught (over which he had been the toparch, before he was called to the supreme authority), and neither intimidated by Henry's numerous host, nor by the unjust Bull of the Sovereign Pontiff (who he well knew was an Englishman by birth), made vigorous preparations to assert by arms the rights and liberties of his kingdom."

It is needless for me to point out the anachronisms that our gallant colonel mixes up with his narrative. Let it suffice to remark that in his eyes the Bull attributed to Pope Adrian was an exceedingly suspicious document, and in any case very unjust, as the English aggression itself had been.

SECTION 6.—ANTONY AND FRANCIS PAGI.

These two writers discussed the question superficially. They took no trouble to fathom it thoroughly.

In his notes on the Annals of Baronius, under the year 1159, Antony Pagi, thinking to correct the learned Cardinal, who gave the Bull without date, cites Raoul de Diceto, who refers it to 1154, but adopts with Matthew Paris the date 1155. "Baronius, num. 21 et seqq., refert Hadriani papæ epistolam Anglorum regi scriptam sine die et mense, in qua laudat eum quod velit in Hiberniam intrare, et eam dominio sancti Petri subjicere. Eamdem epistolam recitat Radulphus de Diceto in Imaginibus Historiarum, p. 529, et eam cum anno 1154 copulat. Verum cum Henricus II. rex Angliæ coronatus sit exeunte decembri ejusdem Christi anni, non potuit eo anno literas ab Hadriano IV. recipere, ideoque Mathæus Parisius eam accurate cum anno 1155 connectit."

Treating of the question again at the year 1171, Antony Pagi considers himself happy in citing Giraldus Cambrensis! He blames Alford and Lynch for raising any doubt regarding the genuineness of the Bull. "Quia ante præsentem annum (1171) Henricus II. expeditionem illam illius suscepit, Alfordus hoc anno num. 36 de sinceritate illius

diplomatis dubitat, quod, inquit, Mathæus Paris, et aliqui antiqui rerum Anglicarum historici illius non meminerent. Verum jam anno 1159 Mathæum Parisiensem, et Radulphum de Diceto, qui hoc sæculo vixit, citavi, et utrique nunc addo Giraldum Cambrensem, qui hoc etiam tempore vivebat."

Francis Pagi, nephew of Antony, published in 1718 the *Breviarum* of the history of the Popes, in four volumes, quarto. Too often he limited himself to copying the notes that his uncle had made on Baronius. For Francis Pagi the Bull of Adrian is genuine in all its parts. "Diploma illud omni ex parte sincerum et genuinum, ac juxta illud Henricus rex anno 1171 expeditionem Hibernicam suscepit." He cites Hoveden and Gervase, who do not speak of the Bull. As for the Council, Francis Pagi takes care not to say whether it was held at Cashel or at Lismore. But if Henry II. made the expedition to Ireland in virtue of a Bull of Adrian, how are we to explain that Pope Alexander III. relied upon a supposed voluntary submission of the Irish bishops in order to confirm to King Henry and his successors the possession of Ireland, as Francis Pagi, following Hoveden, assures us? "Auctoritate apostolica confirmavit (Alexander) illi et hæredibus suis regnum Hiberniæ secundum formam chartarum archiepiscoporum et episcoporum Hiberniæ." Hoveden is excusable, as he knew nothing of a Bull of Adrian; but Francis Pagi, who had just pronounced boldly for the genuineness of the Bull, should naturally have said that Pope Alexander, confirming the diploma of his predecessor, gave Ireland to the King and his heirs conformably to this Bull. By relying on a spontaneous submission of the Irish, the existence of the Bull is denied. (*Breviarium*, t. 3, p. 93.)

SECTION 7.—MCGEOGHEGAN.

I can do nothing better than let the author speak for himself. Although his thesis is not complete, it is full of judicious observations, which greatly shake the credit of the Bull. After what I have said in the foregoing chapters, I have no need to make a few reservations on some particular points, and I leave them to the sagacity of the reader.

"The English having put an end to this monarchy in the twelfth century, and wishing to give some colour of justice to their usurpation and to the tyranny that they practised against the inhabitants of this island, without any other title than a pretended Bull of Adrian IV. and the law of the strongest, represented them as savages who dwelt in woods.

"The title of Henry II. had no foundation but a Bull obtained furtively from Pope Adrian IV., an Englishman by birth. The motive of the Bull was a false account that Henry had given to the Pope, regarding the impiety and the barbarity of the Irish nation. Cambrensis was appointed to verify in writing this representation, on which the grant of the Bull had been extorted. He did not fail to strew his work with absurdities and unwarrantable calumnies, but which the credit of a powerful King knew how to make available at Rome. It was in this spirit that Cambrensis laboured at his memoirs, and it was from them that English writers took the false colours under which ancient Ireland was represented. Passion and interest made these writers pass over the retractation that Cambrensis felt himself obliged to make, in the latter years of his life, of many false imputations with which he had filled his memoirs. Moreover, Cambrensis had not the qualities requisite for an historian. History is not a mere product of the imagination. He spent only eighteen months altogether in Ireland, and he saw only a third part of it, which obeyed England. He could not even set his foot with safety in the rest of the kingdom. It being impossible for him to consult the annals of this people, written in a language to which he was a total stranger, he found it necessary to replace truth by falsehoods and the fancies of a prepossessed mind, in order to swell up his volumes." (*Histoire d'Irlande*, t. I., discours prelim., n. 12.)

"Can anyone suspect the Vicar of Jesus Christ for an injustice so crying? Can anyone believe him capable of dictating a Bull that overthrew a whole nation, dispossessed so many old proprietors of their patrimonies, led to the shedding of so much blood, and caused the ruin of religion in this island? It is a thing inconceivable.

"In point of fact, if we consider the circumstances and the motives of this Bull, it has all the characteristics of a

Bull forged under the borrowed name of Adrian. It is given in Baronius without date of year or day, which renders it very suspicious. It remained seventeen years without seeing the light : it was written, we are told, in 1155, and was not made public till 1172. . . .

" We derive no great advantage in favour of this Bull from the authority of John of Salisbury (afterwards Bishop of Chartres) in his treatise *De Nugis Curialibus*. This writer is made to say towards the end of the last chapter of his fourth book that at his request Pope Adrian granted Ireland to King Henry, to be possessed by him by a title of inheritance, because all islands belonged to the Roman Church by a concession of the Emperor Constantine. But learned men regard this passage as a mere rigmarole added by a foreign hand, because the author, when speaking expressly of his visit to the Holy Father at Bevenentum, where he remained three months, mentions various conversations that he had with his Holiness, even to their least circumstances, without, however, saying a single word of the Bull in question. Yet the affair was of sufficiently great importance : and this was naturally the occasion to speak of it. . . .

" King Henry, who had found satellites sufficiently devoted to avenge him on the holy prelate of Canterbury, was not at a loss for venal penmen to add to and to take from the writings of the time, so as to clothe with an appearance of reality a diploma that was so necessary to justify his conduct.

" It seems that Salisbury made the journey to Italy from his master, in order to visit Adrian, his fellow-countryman, but without any commission on the part of the King : since the Bull, according to Matthew of Westminster, was the fruit of a solemn embassy that Henry sent to the Pope ; although, to say what I think, this embassy appears to be only a new fable added to the former one. . . .

" The silence that Newbridge, an English contemporary author, observes regarding this embassy and the Bull supposed to have been its fruit, is an argument which, though negative, deserves some consideration. This author, zealous in sounding the praises of Henry and of his nation, begins his narrative by saying that the English had entered Ireland with a military force, and that, their

numbers being increased, they subdued a great part of it. He does not say a word of a Bull granted by a Pope. Is it probable that he would have forgotten a circumstance so necessary in order to give some colour of justice to the irregular conduct of his nation? I think not. (Page 540.)

"The Bull speaks only of islands. But I do not see why an island, or a kingdom in the ocean, ought to belong to the Holy See, as is said in the Bull, rather than a kingdom on the mainland, unless I am informed that it (the Holy See) holds the sovereignty of all islands from the liberality of the Emperor Constantine : to which I reply that Ireland, which had never obeyed the Romans, could not be one of this number ; therefore, the pretension made with regard to Ireland is frivolous, and the grant made in consequence is unjust. Such a pretension might be better founded with regard to Great Britain, which obeyed the Romans before and after the reign of Constantine. . . .

"English authors also present to us a Bull of Alexander III., which confirms that of Adrian, and which seems to be of the same stamp. . . . If we compare this Bull and the previous one with the treatise on Conquered Ireland written at the same time by Giraldus Cambrensis, we shall find in these works a great similarity of style ; and, if they are not all from the same hand, they at least seem made for mutual support, and to gain credit reciprocally one for another.

"The Bull of Alexander III. must seem a paradox to all who examine closely the manners of Henry, and his conduct towards the Court of Rome. A bad Christian makes a bad Apostle. What was Henry II. ? A man who, in his private conduct, failed in the essential duties of religion, often even in those of nature. Superstitious, he joined, under the veil of religion, the holiest practices with the most frightful disorders. Faithless in his words, he broke according to his humour the most solemn treaties. Like his predecessors, a sworn enemy of the Popes, he attacked their rights, persecuted their adherents, dismissed contemptuously their legates, encroached on the immunities of the Church, and took pleasure in encouraging the most unjust usurpers : this was what caused the martyrdom of Saint Thomas of Canterbury. Finally, his debaucheries are acknowledged by all historians. No one is ignorant that

he carried them so far as to seduce Alice, the betrothed of his son Richard, and that this passion, as obstinate as it was foolish and criminal, occasioned nearly all the misfortunes that troubled the close of his days. Behold then, the apostle, behold the reformer, whom the Holy See should have chosen to convert Ireland! The misunderstanding between the Sovereign Pontiff and the King of England was carried to its furthest limits by the martyrdom of Saint Thomas: can anyone believe that in such circumstances the Pope would have openly laden with benefits a man who was tacitly excommunicated? Can anyone suppose that his Holiness would have chosen, for the conversion of Ireland, a prince in conflict with the Holy See? It is not possible to admit such ideas. . . (Page 442.)

"After all that I have just said of the state of religion in Ireland during the five hundred and fifty years that passed before the reign of Henry II.; of the many councils assembled for the regulation of manners and the restoration of discipline; of so many holy and learned prelates who did honour to religion, and of whom several were thought worthy to be called in 1179 to the third general council of Lateran; of so many zealous missionaries who had quitted their native land, their ministry not seeming indispensable at home, to go and instruct foreign nations;¹

¹ The early missionary voyages of St. Brendan, though afterwards turned into fabulous legends by story-tellers, just as works of fiction are produced at the present day, had a European fame. He is supposed to have visited America, and to have preached to the Aborigines there, among whom traces of Christianity and civilisation were afterwards found. The following incident in connection with the discovery of America may be interesting:—

"It is a well-known fact that Columbus, while maturing his plans for his great expedition, visited Ireland as well as Iceland in quest of information bearing on his theories. He was assisted in his researches by an Irish gentleman named Patrick Maguire, who accompanied him also on his great voyage of discovery. There are other Irish names on the roster of the ship's crew, preserved in the archives at Madrid; but it is specially recorded by Father Tornitori, an Italian priest in the seventeenth century, of Patrick Maguire, that he was the first to set foot on American soil. On the eventful morning of his landing, the boats bearing Columbus and some of his crew were launched; but approaching the land, the water shallowed, and Patrick Maguire jumped out to lighten the boat, and then waded ashore."—*Brendaniana*, by the Rev. Denis O'Donoghue, P.P., Ardfert, p. 333.

For a short, vivid, interesting sketch of St. Columba's voyages,

of so many foundations made by the generosity of the faithful ; and, finally, of so many examples of virtue given by the chiefs of the nation : can anyone imagine that corruption was so general and so inveterate as is represented in the two Bulls ?

“ The majority of those who went to Ireland under Henry II. were the descendants of Normans, real adventurers, for whom nothing was sacred. These, then, were the teachers whom Henry II. sent into Ireland, by apostolic authority forsooth, to correct morals, and to restore religion ! Their conduct was much more proper to shake the faith of true believers than to confirm them in Christianity.

“ A conquest, to be lawful, supposes a war whose motive is just ; such as an injury from those who are to be conquered. There was no war between the Irish and the English ; and, if the King of Leinster brought them to help him in recovering his crown, he rewarded them well. He could not transfer to them any right over the other provinces, because he had none himself.” (Page 456.)

SECTION 8.--DR. LINGARD.

Although this judicious historian does not directly examine the question of genuineness, he lets us see that he has little faith in the Bull.

First, the pretended donation must have been extorted by captious and false representations of the King : “ To justify the invasion of a free and unoffending people, his ambition had discovered that the civilisation of their manners and the reform of their clergy were benefits which the Irish ought cheerfully to purchase with the loss of their independence.” (*History of England*, Reign of Henry II.)

The historian qualifies as *singular* the negotiation of Salisbury at Rome : “ Fourteen years after this singular negotiation, a few Welsh adventurers landed in Ireland.”

He points out the disagreement between the Pseudo-

missions, and labours, see *Derriana*, by the Most Rev. Dr. O'Doherty, Bishop of Derry, p. 85.

For numerous lists of Irish Saints and scholars, as well as monastic foundations, on the Continent, see Haverty's *History of Ireland*, chapters, xi., xii., xv., and xvi.—*Trans.*

Salisbury and the Bull: "John of Salisbury, who must have known its real purport, calls it a grant of inheritance." But the Bull expresses no such idea: "It is, however, observable that Adrian in this instrument avoids the usual language of feudal grants."

Not being able to discuss every fact, Lingard confines himself to transcribing from chroniclers. Admitting that Salisbury brought the Bull, what use did Henry II. make of it? "Other projects offered themselves to Henry's ambition; and the Papal letter was consigned to oblivion in the archives of the castle of Winchester."

Fourteen years rolled by before the landing of a few adventurers on the Irish coast.

During the five months that Henry spent in Ireland (1171-1172), he never spoke of the Bull. Nor did he add an inch of territory to that acquired by the first adventurers.

Five years later, according to Giraldus Cambrensis, the Bull was at length divulged. "It was during this period, when his authority in Ireland was nearly annihilated, that Henry bethought him of the letter which he had formerly procured from Pope Adrian. It had been forgotten during almost twenty years: now it was drawn from obscurity, was intrusted to William Fitz-Aldhelm and Nicholas . . . and was read by them with much solemnity to a synod of Irish bishops."¹

¹ How innocent of Henry II. to forget all about the papal letter, making him a present of Ireland! Let us, however, not forget that it is an old practice with many Englishmen to invent plans and plots by which the ordinary observer may be deceived. Thus, when, in the reign of James I, there was question of sweeping the Irish from their lands in Ulster, Sir John Davis advised that they should all get *legal grants* from the King, after which "His Majesty's blessed genius will banish all those generations of vipers out of it." What cunning and perfidy! (*State Papers*, 1606-8, pp. 273-4.)

Plots having been invented, great merit was gained by their discovery at a convenient time, and they were used as a justification for the most unjustifiable measures. See *Gunpowder Plot*, by the Rev. John Gerard, S. J. It gives a good idea of the plotting spirit in the days of "Crafty Cecil."

Titus Oates, by his plot, obtained a pension of £1,200 a year from Charles II. His story, however, having in the reign of James II. been proved a mere concoction, he was condemned to be imprisoned for life, to be whipped, and to stand in the pillory four times. Afterwards, favoured again by fortune, he obtained a pension of £400 a year from William III.—*Trans.*

Lingard adds with much good sense: "How far it served to convince these prelates that the King was the rightful sovereign of the island, we are left to conjecture."

The letter of Adrian to Louis VII. did not escape the attention of Lingard. While following the opinion that this letter referred to Spain, the judicious writer found in it a presumption against authority for the Irish expedition: "When Louis a few years later meditated a similar expedition into Spain, and for that purpose requested the *consilium et favorem Romanæ ecclesiæ*, the answer was very different. Adrian dissuaded him, because it was *inconsulta ecclesia et populo terræ illius*."¹

SECTION 9.—MR. O'CALLAGHAN.

Although this writer has several times treated of Pope Adrian and the Bull, his arguments are common and ordinary. They present nothing new, no interesting view. I content myself with a summary of them, without again going over ground already passed.

Here, then, are the seven reasons of this esteemed writer:—1. The testimony of John of Salisbury. 2. The Bull of Adrian, related *in extenso* in Giraldus Cambrensis and contemporaries. 3. The Bulls of Alexander. 4. The publication of these Bulls in a Council at Waterford. 5. The complaints that the Irish sent to John XXII., with a copy of Adrian's Bull—which copy the Pontiff forwarded to King Edward II. 6. The insertion of the Bull *ex Codice Vaticano* in the Annals of Baronius. 7. Lastly, the Roman Bullarium printed in 1739 gives the Bull.

This worthy writer imagined in good faith that all his documents were true, genuine, official, unquestionable, and of conclusive value!

He was probably awakened from his dreams on the appearance of the Memoir of which it remains for me to speak, and from which I have already borrowed so much.

¹ This is a good point from Dr. Lingard. How unreasonable to suppose that in 1159 Pope Adrian IV. dissuaded Louis VII. from invading Spain, *inconsulta ecclesia et populo terræ illius*, and that in 1155 the same Pope authorized Henry II. to invade Ireland, making no account of the *ecclesia* and *populus* there? Father Chaillot does not believe in either story.—*Trans.*

SECTION 10.—THE “IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD.”

Although the question of Pope Adrian has not to-day the importance it had in former times, there are circumstances which occasionally require us to revert to it. Thus, a few years ago, a portion of the Irish Press opened a discussion on the genuineness of the Bull, with the foolish hope of weakening in the minds of a Catholic people their attachment to the Holy See.

Protestants, always happy in being able to injure a Pope, slipped the Bull of Adrian into elementary educational works. Dr. Moran quotes Professor Richey, who, writing for the pupils of a Ladies' College, gave a very erroneous translation of the Bull, as if the Pope had authorised Henry to subjugate the country, and to take possession of the island, while the Pontifical letter, apocryphal as it is, abstracts from all idea of conquest, and contains no transfer of dominion.

Some people have set forth the Bull as a definition *ex cathedra*; but this idea bears no examination. The Bull, even if it were genuine, has none of the conditions of a dogmatic definition.

In our days it would not be easy to forge or to accredit a false Bull, because there would be little delay in disowning it. The Middle Ages, which had no printing or telegraph offices, were often led into error by apocryphal documents, which had a very long life.

At all periods the Irish nation, as if by an infallible instinct, has rejected the false Bull of Adrian, and loudly declared that it was nothing but a trick of the English.

I content myself with these brief observations, because I intend to give Dr. Moran's Memoir among my justifying papers.

CHAPTER XXXIII.

THE FATE OF APOCRYPHAL DOCUMENTS.

THE Bull of Adrian has shared the common fate of apocryphal works. Although the false decretals of Isidore Mercator and the famous donation of Constantine had a very

tough life, it was not given them to prevail, by taking rank among authentic title-deeds.

The decretals of the False Isidore obtained such favour with scholars that they lasted seven hundred years. Divulged in the middle of the ninth century, the loss of their credit began in the sixteenth.¹

But we must carefully remark that the favour attached to the work of Mercator continued with a very large number of documents that it contained. As for what belonged properly to the false decretals, they had no influence on the discipline of the Church. In effect, the disciplinary falsification of the Pseudo-Isidore may be summed up under three heads:—1. The pretended necessity of obtaining the previous consent of the Pope for convoking a council, even a provincial one. This did not pass into canonical discipline at any period. The Council of Trent commanded a triennial assembly. 2. It has never been held in the Church that the presence of seventy-two bishops is needed to judge the criminal cause of a bishop, as Mercator would have it. 3. Canonical procedure has remained what it was before the appearance of the false decretals. No one has ever taken seriously in the Church the pretended prohibition of letting laics bear witness against clerics, or clerics themselves against laics. Thanks be to God! the false decretals have had their day.

I admire how the Sovereign Pontiffs, by a wonderful instinct, have always shown prudence in holding out at arm's length, or with the tongs, the false Bull of Adrian, even on occasions when it might have seemed useful or necessary to mention it. This has been the course, not only with the Cardinals of Avranches, but with Innocent III., John XXII., Paul IV., St. Pius V. in his Bull against Elizabeth, Gregory XIII., and Clement VIII., as I have shown above.

¹ The collection of decretals, &c., attributed to Isidore Mercator is supposed to have appeared first in France, between the years 829 and 847. Who Isidore was, and whether he really was the forger, is not certain. Many persons believed the work to be from the pen of St. Isidore of Seville, who was a celebrated writer and they therefore gave implicit credit to it. It is said to contain false decretals attributed to more than sixty Popes, and false canons attributed to many Councils. In the sixteenth century it began to be looked upon with suspicion. Since that time, it has been known in its true light, as a mere forgery, though containing much that is true with much that is false.—*Trans.*

The great author of the misfortunes of Ireland, the cause chiefly responsible for its unexampled calamities, was Protestantism.

The "Bull of Adrian" had no serious influence on the enslavement of the country. In point of fact, so long as the Catholic religion prevailed in England as well as in Ireland, the English, notwithstanding their constant endeavours, could hardly extend the limits fixed by the early adventurers.

In our days the Apocryphal Bull is passing through the seventh century of its existence. For a long period it has abused the credulity of the unlearned, and the leisure of the learned, who found themselves obliged to discuss it. It is time that it should go down for ever into the grave in which lie buried the decretals of Isidore Mercator, and so many other forgeries that troubled the peace of our predecessors.

God grant that my labour may not have the fate of delaying for a single day the complete overthrow of the imposture!

DOCUMENTS.

No. 1.

(The *Analecta* here gives an article on Pope Adrian IV. from the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record*, of November, 1872, written by the Most Rev. Dr. Moran, then Bishop of Ossory—afterwards

CARDINAL MORAN, ARCHBISHOP OF SYDNEY.

This article was republished in the *Australasian Catholic Record*, for 1897, with further remarks from his Eminence after twenty-five years of reflection. That the reader may have the benefit of these valuable remarks, it is from the Australian volume that we take the whole essay.—*Trans.*)

POPE ADRIAN THE FOURTH, AND THE SUPPOSED GRANT OF IRELAND TO KING HENRY THE SECOND.

THOUGH it is our special purpose in this paper to discuss the authenticity of the Papal Letter by which Adrian the Fourth is supposed to have made a gift of Ireland to Henry the Second, yet it will not be uninteresting to briefly sketch some incidents in the life of this illustrious Pontiff. For many English readers the most remarkable fact connected with him is that he was the only Englishman who ever held the high dignity of Successor of St. Peter. Under many other respects, however, his career was truly singular, and he in a special manner won the admiration of contemporaries by his unconquerable heroism in defending the rights of the Holy See. One of his biographers described him as "a man of mild and kindly bearing, esteemed for his high character and learning, famous as a preacher, and renowned for his fine voice" (Muratori, *Vita*, iii., part 1, 441). His pontificate was short, extending over less than five years, from December, 1154, to September, 1159. But for those who take the trouble to examine the contemporary chronicles, not a few remarkable events will be found crowded into that brief period.

Adrian the Fourth was known in early life as Nicholas Breakspeare, and most English writers, judging from the surname, contend that he was of Norman and not of Anglo-Saxon descent. Mr. Tarleton, the latest writer of his life, in the elaborate work just published, *Nicholas Breakspear, Englishman and Pope*, (London, 1896), considers that "this surname may have been attached to the family from its place of residence." He finds that as early as the Domesday Book there was a farm or hamlet called Breakspears, situated on the edge of the table-land, or

plateau, on which stands the ancient parish (church) of Harefield, and just sheltered by the brow of the hill sloping down to the fertile valley of the Colne. He adds the shrewd remark: "In those days it is far more probable that a place should give a name to a man than that a man should give a name to a place." In accordance with this suggestion, it is not improbable that the family of the future Pope migrated from the Breakspears district to the neighbourhood of Abbot's Langley, in Hertfordshire, and thus he may well have been of Anglo-Saxon descent.

Nicholas was of humble parentage. His father, having become a widower, entered the Benedictine Monastery of St. Alban's as a lay-brother, and for fifty years, till his death, continued to rank as such. He outlived his son Pope Adrian, and it presents a characteristic picture of those times that the father was permitted to retain his lowly position at the monastery, while his son was elevated to the most exalted dignity in Christendom. At the hamlet of Abbot's Langley,¹ Nicholas was born about the year 1100, a few years after the birth of St. Bernard. In his youth he appears to have been dependent on the monks of St. Alban's monastery for his support no less than for his education. He gave proof, however, of quick parts, and being desirous to embrace the religious life, he petitioned to be admitted to the monastery. His petition was rejected, probably on account of his father being already enrolled as a lay-brother, and Nicholas, with no provision save the meagre equipment of a "poor scholar," set out to seek his fortune and to perfect himself in higher studies in the schools of Paris. Mr. Tarleton writes: "After his final failure to enter St. Alban's, he worked his way, probably through London and down the high road through Kent, that historic route which has been the main thoroughfare of so many travellers to and from the metropolis, past Rochester and Canterbury, to Dover, from whence he obtained a passage over the narrow seas, possibly in the very same year (1120) when the *Blanche Neuf* was wrecked on the treacherous rocks off Barfleur, and the brilliant company surrounding Prince William, together with that unfortunate son of King Henry, were drowned. Here the career of Nicholas may fairly be said to have commenced."

It was probably at the halls of the Abbey of St. Denys at Paris that Nicholas Breakspeare pursued his higher studies. From Matthew Paris we learn that he became a most painstaking scholar, and betook himself so much in earnest to the acquisition of learning that he excelled all his companions, and proving himself possessed of rare qualities of temper, and endowed with a natural gift of eloquence, received much praise from all his instructors.

He quitted Paris about the year 1125, crossed the Rhone, and entered Arles, then a town of considerable importance in the territory of Provence. Here he frequented the schools for which the town was famous, and it was probably here that he had as his

¹ The hamlet belonged to the monastery of St. Alban's, and was called Abbot's Langley to distinguish it from a neighbouring hamlet which was called King's Langley, a royal seat where Edmund, son of Edward III., and Duke of York, was born.

master the Irishman Marianus, for whom in after life he continued to cherish the highest esteem. After a while, filled with the desire of embracing the religious life, he wended his way to Avignon to offer himself as a subject in one of the numerous monasteries which in those days were a distinguishing feature of this beautiful part of France, and the ruins of which may still be seen by many a pleasant stream, and on many a commanding hill. The Abbey of St. Rufus of the Canons Regular of St. Augustine was one of the most famous of those religious institutions in the environs of Avignon. Thither Nicholas one evening bent his steps, and begged to be admitted among the brethren. He was allowed to remain on trial. During the two years he spent in probation, he appears to have been engaged in teaching, and, as William of Newburgh attests, "he strove by every means in his power to conciliate the brothers, and being a man of much personal beauty, cheerful in spirit, cautious of speech, and always obedient to authority, he succeeded in pleasing everyone." When his time of probation expired, the Canons Regular were unanimous in admitting him to their ranks, and thus Nicholas at length attained the great purpose of his life by taking the religious vows, and devoting himself to the service of Christ. Being remarkable no less for the observance of Rule than for his singular ability, he in a few years was appointed Prior, and on the death of Abbot William in 1137, he was further chosen his successor, and was installed in that high office with great solemnity.

St. Bernard was at this time stirring up the fervour of religious observance in the communities of France, and Nicholas, now Abbot of St. Rufus, resolved to leave nothing undone that the Canons Regular of St. Augustine, by strict discipline, might be quickened with the true spirit of their holy Rule. Some of the Religious, however, demurred to what they styled the Abbot's innovations in their Rule, and appealed in person to Rome. This occasioned the Abbot's first visit to Italy, in the springtime of 1145. Pope Eugene the Third, a Cistercian according to St. Bernard's own heart, had just then been advanced to the See of St. Peter, and the reforming Abbot Nicholas was sure to find favour at his hands. Words of conciliation and exhortation were addressed by the Sovereign Pontiff to the appellant Canons of St. Rufus, and the Abbot returned to Avignon to resume the work of reform which he had begun. The spirit of disaffection, however, was not extinguished, and being gradually fanned into a flame, broke out in the following year more violently than before. The fact of the Abbot being a stranger intensified their discontent. A second time the appellants and the Abbot proceeded to Rome. The Pope ere this had become fully acquainted with the merits of the Abbot Nicholas, and admired his firmness and his zeal in restoring the vigour of religious discipline among those under his care. He dismissed the appellant Canons with the words: "I know the pretext by which Satan has ensnared you into this quarrel. Return to your Abbey: choose a Superior with whom you can, or rather with whom you shall have the will to be at peace: the Abbot from whom you appeal shall henceforth be engaged in the immediate service of the Holy See, and shall not be a further burden to you."

Thus it was that Abbot Nicholas became attached to the Papal Court, and there the highest dignities in the gift of the Pontiff soon awaited him.

The year 1147 was in many respects eventful. The Second Crusade was about to commence. All Christendom was aroused by the eloquence of St. Bernard of Clairveaux, and Pope Eugene the Third proceeded to Paris to present the pilgrim's staff to the French King, Louis the Seventh. Nicholas Breakspeare appears to have accompanied the Pontiff on this occasion. His knowledge of the various languages stood him in good behest, and it is stated that he greatly charmed all who came in contact with him.

There is no record of the date of his elevation to the Cardinalate. It was certainly not later than December, 1151, for his name as Cardinal is attached to a Bull of Pope Eugene of that date.

In 1152, an arduous mission was assigned to him by Pope Eugene the Third, which through his ability and zeal was attended with complete success. It was nothing less than to proceed to Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, with the authority of Papal Legate, to heal the religious dissensions that had arisen in those countries. The cause of these dissensions may be briefly stated. The Scandinavian kingdoms were all embraced in the Metropolitan See of Hamburg till the year 1102, when at the request of the King of Denmark the Danish city of Lund was erected into a Metropolitan See, and the churches in Sweden and Norway were made subject to it. These kingdoms, though at one time united with Denmark, had now proclaimed their independence, and they regarded it as an encroachment on their freedom that they should be subject in spiritual matters to the Danish Metropolitan See. The northern kingdoms were further rent by civil dissensions, and all parties looked to Rome for a healing remedy and for guidance in their distracted state. Cardinal Breakspeare, as Papal Legate received full powers to restore religious peace throughout Scandinavia, and in his instructions he was admonished to "preach the Gospel throughout that province and to use every endeavour to gain the souls of the natives to the honour of Almighty God."

The Legate passed through England, and sailed from the English coast for Norway, where he landed on July the 19th, 1152. He found the country in the greatest confusion. The throne was occupied by the three sons of the murdered King Harold, and all the sad results of jealousy and ambition and civil war ensued. The first care of Cardinal Breakspeare was to set the civil discord at rest. He then proceeded to heal the religious wounds of the kingdom. He thoroughly reformed the Church, and swept away the abuses which had crept in amid the civil disorders. In the Cathedral of Nidrosa, the modern Drontheim, reposed the relics of the holy bishop, St. Olaf. He selected that city for the Metropolitan dignity, and subjected to its authority not only the other Norwegian Sees with the Orkneys, Hebrides, and Faroe Islands, but also Iceland and Greenland, the Shetlands, and Western Islands of Scotland, and the Isle of Man. The Church of Norway thus obtained all that it was anxious for, and the name of the Legate was held everywhere in benediction. Tarleton writes: "All honour was ascribed to him, and his character and firmness

being in such sharp contrast to their own rulers, he became the hero of the whole nation, and was certainly the most powerful man in Norway at that date." The national historian, Snorow, relates that no foreigner ever came to Norway who was so honoured, or whose memory is so cherished as that of Nicholas Breakspeare. To this day his name is mentioned in Norwegian history as one of the benefactors of the nation, and after his death a place was assigned him among the national Saints.

He next proceeded to Sweden, called a synod in the city of Lingkopin, and appointed a Bishop of Upsala. It was not so easy to reconcile Denmark to all these changes. Nevertheless in this, too, his efforts were crowned with success. The See of Lund was allowed a sort of primatial pre-eminence over all the Scandinavian Churches, and its Archbishop was honoured with the title of *Legatus natus Apostolicæ Sedis*. During the Cardinal's stay in Denmark, the King, Sweno, to avenge some outrages, had declared war against Sweden. The Cardinal used all his influence in vain to maintain peace, and he is reported to have said that "the Danes could expect nothing else but destruction to themselves in their proposed campaign." The event justified his expectations. Drawn by a feigned retreat far into Finland, the Danish army was surrounded, and almost entirely destroyed.

Cardinal Breakspeare returned to Rome in the beginning of November, 1154, and throughout his homeward journey as in Rome itself, he was everywhere saluted as "the Apostle of the North."

Many changes had taken place in the capital of the Christian world during the two years of his absence. Pope Eugene the Third had been summoned to his reward, and had had for his successor the Bishop of Sabina, aged ninety years, who ascended the Papal Chair under the name of Anastasius the Fourth. On the 3rd of December, 1154, only a few weeks after Cardinal Breakspeare's arrival in Rome, the Pontificate of Pope Anastasius was cut short by death. Rome being in a very disturbed state, the Cardinals met in St. Peter's without delay, and with one voice chose Nicholas Breakspeare as the successor of St. Peter to guide the helm of Holy Church. He at first declined the onerous charge, but the clergy and laity took up the cry "Nicholas elected by God," and at length he bent his shoulders to the burden. He took the title of Adrian the Fourth, and his coronation was celebrated with great pomp in St. Peter's, on the 24th December, 1154.

His pontificate of four years and eight months was full of stirring events, and his saying, as reported by John of Salisbury, that "the Pope's tiara was splendid because it burned with fire," was fully verified in his short but brilliant career. Dr. Creighton, Protestant Bishop of London, in the *Dictionary of National Biography*, writing of Adrian the Fourth, says that his "pontificate was a period of constant struggles mainly of his own seeking." Now nothing can be more false than this. He was engaged in constant struggles, indeed, but they were forced upon him by those who were jealous of the spiritual authority, or coveted the temporalities of the Church, and he proved himself throughout these varied contests an unswerving champion of the rights in those days attached to the Holy See.

The first great difficulty that presented itself to the newly elected Pope was the attitude of the Roman citizens. They had been seized for some years with a frenzy of republican fanaticism, and now under the guidance of the popular tribune, Arnold of Brescia, they resolved to brook no further delay in transferring their theories into facts. Rome was to become once more the centre of the world's civil authority, her old-time grandeur was to be renewed. The Church, however, was to be shorn of all its privileges, its wealth, its land, its possessions, its dues; and paganism, under another name, was to resume its sway on the Capitol.

Immediately on the election of Pope Adrian, the Roman Senate sent him an imperious demand that he would recognise the Roman Republic. In his reply the Pontiff commanded them on their peril to return to their allegiance, and to compel Arnold of Brescia to quit the city. The Republicans would listen to no such counsel, and to emphasise their determination they attacked the aged Cardinal Guido as he was proceeding along the Via Sacra, and inflicted serious wounds of which he soon after died. The Pope, however, made them realise that they had to do with a man whom no terrors could turn aside from the path of duty. For the first time in the history of the Christian world, Rome was subjected to an Interdict, to commence on Palm Sunday (1155), the very time when pilgrims from all parts of Christendom were accustomed to flock into the Eternal City. This terrible blow smote at the same time the earthly and the spiritual interests of the citizens. The Senate, without delay, banished Arnold from the city, and presented a humble petition to the Pope. The Interdict was at once removed, and the Easter Feast was kept with more than usual splendour and rejoicing.

Another storm, however, was now threatening from the North. When Frederick Barbarossa succeeded to the imperial throne of Germany the Roman Senate forwarded to him an invitation to come to Rome to receive the Imperial Crown at their hands. The reply of Barbarossa was to cross the Alps in November, 1154, with a large army, with the avowed intent of asserting his imperial rights in Italy, and punishing the insolence of the Republicans of Rome. The Emperor proceeded slowly on his course, securing the fealty of the Italian cities through which he passed. The vicissitudes of these cities need not at present detain us. Suffice it to say that on the 10th of April, 1153, Barbarossa, as King of Italy, received the Iron Crown in the Church of St. Michael at Pavia. He now avowed his intention to receive, at the hands of the Pontiff, the Imperial Crown in Rome, and sent deputies to convey his wishes to Pope Adrian. On the other hand, the Pope dispatched three Cardinals to meet the Emperor, to acquaint him with the actual condition of the city, and to learn what his intentions were in regard to its temporal rule. In the meantime, the Pope proceeded to Civita Castellana, on the borders of the Campagna, about midway between Viterbo and Rome.

We must now revert to Arnold of Brescia. When he fled from Rome, he endeavoured to form a league of some of the Italian nobility to stir up the citizens of Rome against the Pope and

against the Emperor. As a preliminary to the Imperial consecration, Adrian the Fourth required that the Emperor would put an end to this attempt at sedition. Arnold soon fell a captive into the hands of Barbarossa, and was consigned in chains to Castel Sant' Angelo, in Rome. On a former occasion when Arnold was a prisoner, the citizens had revolted and set him free. The Pope was now absent from the city, at Civita Castellana, and the prefect of the city, seeing no other escape from imminent risk, had the prisoner led out from the castle and secretly put to death. His remains were burned and his ashes were flung into the Tiber. Such is the narrative of the ancient chronicler. This, however, would not suffice for Dr. Creighton. He would place the execution of Arnold at a later period, when the Pope was in Rome, and when the Emperor, after his coronation at St. Peter's, had to repel an attack of the rebellious citizens. He writes: "Adrian the Fourth used the opportunity of the Emperor's wrath to urge the execution of Arnold of Brescia, who was tried before the Papal officials, and put to death." For such statements there is not a particle of historic evidence. Sismondi, too, gives a dramatic account of the slow burning of Arnold fastened to a cross at Porta del Popolo. Even Dean Milman characterises such an argument as "pure fiction" (*Latin Christianity*, iv., 412).

The Pope's embassy to Barbarossa brought back the pleasant announcement that the Emperor had no hostile intentions whatever against the Pope, that he was ready to pay all honour to Holy Church and to the See of Rome, and prayed Adrian to publicly and with all solemnity crown him in St. Peter's. Barbarossa, however, was a prince of very doubtful character, from whom Adrian had but little to expect. Tarleton describes him "as a man of boundless ambition, combined with great personal strength and courage; in physique he was an ideal hero; but he was unscrupulous, masterful, and imperious. His one object was to rule a united Germany combined with Italy, to be supreme on the Tiber as well as on the Danube. He proclaimed the loftiest notions of the absolute supremacy of the Emperor, and carried with him the enthusiastic support of all the great princes of Germany." Barbarossa with his army had encamped at Sutri, the ancient Sutrium, a small stronghold known as the key of Etruria, which occupied the crest of one of the numerous rocky hills in that rich province of Italy.

Pope Adrian had advanced as far as the picturesque castle of Nepi, with his suite of Cardinals, and a few attendants. The Emperor, having declared his intentions to be pacific, and expressed his wish to meet the Pontiff, Adrian set out, as usual in those days, on horseback, accompanied by a small retinue of Cardinals and guards. As he approached the Imperial camp, a brilliant group of German nobles, their armour flashing in the sunlight, galloped out to meet him, and, joining the procession, escorted him amid the shouts of the troops and the blare of trumpets to the front of the Imperial tent. Barbarossa now came forth in gorgeous armour, and around him were the rough chivalry of Germany. The etiquette of those days required the sovereign, when welcoming the Pope, in recognition of the higher spiritual

authority, to hold the Papal stirrup whilst its owner dismounted. This part of the ceremony Barbarossa resolved not to fulfil. He advanced to meet Adrian, and, bowing low, offered to assist him to dismount. Adrian, however, waited, that the full ceremonial should be observed. Barbarossa's pride would not brook this humiliation. His guards half drew their swords, threatening murmurs were heard in the ranks of the soldiers, the Pope's own retinue turned their horses and fled. Though Adrian was thus almost left alone, yet his courage never for a moment failed. He dismounted without insisting, for the moment, on the prescribed homage, and allowed the Emperor to lead him to the throne prepared for him, where Frederick knelt and kissed his feet. After this ceremony the Emperor rose and approached for the kiss of peace. It was now Adrian's turn. In dignified words he refused to grant it, and told the Emperor that until the usual homage was paid in full he would withhold his blessing and refuse to crown him. Whatever may be our judgment regarding the ceremonial details of those times, one cannot fail to be struck by the magnificent courage of the Pontiff. The Emperor used every argument that could be devised to change Adrian's resolution, but his words might as well be addressed to the rocks of Sutri. Threats or entreaties were alike of no avail to move the steady resolution of the Pope, who next day quitted the camp and returned to Nepi.

Barbarossa, however, was determined to receive coronation at the hands of Adrian, and resolved to submit to the humiliating condition of homage, for without it, he saw no prospect of attaining the great object of his ambition. On June the 11th, he set out for Nepi, accompanied by a brilliant retinue. As he drew near, the Pope rode out to meet him. The Emperor dismounted, advanced on foot, and, kneeling down, held the Pope's stirrup, and assisted him to dismount. This done, Adrian enfolded him in his arms and gave him the kiss of peace amid the ringing cheers of both parties of followers and spectators. As Tarleton remarks: "The splendid firmness of Adrian had gained for him a wonderful success."

The Pope now returned to Rome, and on the morning of the 18th of June, with all solemnity, performed the ceremony of the Emperor's coronation in St. Peter's. How infuriated was the hostile ferment of the citizens against the Germans appears from the fact that they organised an armed band to attack the German army encamped at the Neronian fields, near Ponte Molle, nor did they desist till 200 of the assailants were made prisoners, and about 1000 were slain by the Imperial troops, or were drowned in the Tiber. The prisoners were handed over to Adrian, by whom most of them were liberated in a few days. At the end of June the Emperor and his army quitted Rome and returned to Germany.

During the next two years the Pope was mainly occupied in the south of Italy, disputing with the Normans, who claimed Sicily by right of conquest, and, together with it, a considerable portion of territory on the mainland. The indomitable courage and firmness which had humbled the pride of Barbarossa was also successful in restoring peace in South Italy; and in securing the Norman power as an ally of Rome. In the meantime, the dealings

of Barbarossa with the Church in Germany, and with the cities of North Italy, led to repeated quarrels with the Pope, and embittered the closing days of his life. He was preparing to issue a solemn sentence of excommunication against the Emperor, when he was overtaken by death at Anagni, on the 1st of September, 1159. His remains were interred at St. Peter's, in Rome, where the tomb of the only Englishman who ever wore the Tiara is to the present day an object of interest to countless tourists of the English-speaking world.

* * * * *

The distinctive character of Pope Adrian the Fourth, as sketched in the AUSTRALIAN CATHOLIC RECORD for April, should suffice to show that his supposed Bull, by which a grant of Ireland was made to King Henry the Second cannot be regarded as genuine. The main purpose of Adrian's policy was to defend the Church's independence within her own sphere, and to repel the ever-grasping pretensions of the secular power. In the 250 genuine official letters of the Pontiff that have been preserved to us, we shall seek in vain for even the remotest trace of the flattery and subserviency to the royal authority which are so conspicuous in the supposed Bull. We may now proceed to consider in detail the arguments which are advanced in support of the genuineness of this singular document.

Twenty-five years ago I inserted in the *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* (Dublin, November, 1872), a short essay on this subject, which since then has been repeatedly republished or referred to in the United States and the home countries. It may not be inopportune to here reprint it in full, with a few verbal alterations. This will clear the way for setting forth as briefly as possible the further arguments which have been advanced to set this matter in its full light during the past years.

There was a time when it would be little less than treason to question the genuineness of the Bull by which Pope Adrian the Fourth is supposed to have made a grant of Ireland to Henry the Second; and indeed, from the first half of the thirteenth to the close of the fifteenth century, it was principally through this supposed grant of the Holy See that the English Government sought to justify their claim to hold dominion in that island. However, opinions and times have changed, and at the present day this Bull of Adrian has as little bearing on the connection between England and Ireland as it could possibly have on the union of the Isle of Man with Great Britain.

On the other hand, many writers in a spirit of hostility to the Holy See, have said strange things whilst asserting the genuineness of this famous Bull. I need scarcely remark that it does not seem to have been the love either of Ireland or of historic truth that inspired their declamation. It proceeded mainly from their hatred to the Sovereign Pontiff, and from the vain hope that such exaggerated statements might in some way weaken the devoted affection of the Irish people for Rome.

Laying aside such prejudiced opinions, the controversy as to the genuineness of Adrian's Bull must be viewed in a purely historical light, and its decision must depend on the value and weight of the historical arguments which may be advanced in regard to it.

The following is a literal translation of the old Latin text of Adrian's Bull :—

“ Adrian, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to our most dear Son in Christ, the illustrious King of the English, greeting and the Apostolical Benediction.

“ The thoughts of your Highness are laudably and profitably directed to the greater glory of your name on earth and to the increase of the reward of eternal happiness in heaven, when as a Catholic Prince you propose to yourself to extend the borders of the Church, to announce the truths of the Christian Faith to ignorant and barbarous nations, and to root out the weeds of wickedness from the field of the Lord ; and the more effectually to accomplish this, you implore the counsel and favour of the Holy See. In which matter we feel assured that the higher your aims are, and the more discreet your proceedings, the happier, with God's aid, will be the result ; because those undertakings that proceed from the ardour of faith and the love of religion are sure always to have a prosperous end and issue.

“ It is beyond all doubt, as your highness also doth acknowledge, that Ireland, and all the islands upon which Christ the Sun of Justice has shone, and which have received the knowledge of Christian Faith, are subject to the authority of St. Peter and of the most holy Roman Church. Wherefore, we are the more desirous to sow in them an acceptable seed and a plantation pleasing unto God, because we know that a most rigorous account of them shall be required of us hereafter.

“ Now, most dear Son in Christ, you have signified to us that you propose to enter the island of Ireland to establish the observance of law among its people, and to eradicate the weeds of vice ; and that you are willing to pay from every house one penny as an annual tribute to St. Peter, and to preserve the rights of the churches of the land whole and inviolate. We, therefore, receiving with due favour your pious and laudable desires, and graciously granting our consent to your petition, declare that it is pleasing and acceptable to us, that for the purpose of enlarging the limits of the Church, setting bounds to the torrent of vice, reforming evil manners, planting the seeds of virtue, and increasing Christian Faith, you should enter that island and carry into effect those things which belong to the service of God and to the salvation of that people ; and that the people of that land should honourably receive and reverence you as Lord : the rights of the churches being preserved untouched and entire, and reserving the annual tribute of one penny from every house to St. Peter and the most Holy Roman Church.

“ If, therefore, you resolve to carry these designs into execution, let it be your study to form that people to good morals, and take such orders both by yourself and by those whom you shall find

qualified in faith, in words, and in conduct, that the Church there may be adorned, and the practices of Christian faith be planted and increased; and let all that tends to the glory of God and the salvation of souls be so ordered by you that you may deserve to obtain from God an increase of everlasting reward, and may secure on earth a glorious name throughout all time. Given at Rome," &c.

Before we proceed with the inquiry as to the genuineness of this letter of Pope Adrian, I must detain the reader with a few brief preliminary remarks.

First: Some passages of this important document have been very unfairly dealt with by modern writers while purporting to discuss its merits. Thus, for instance, Professor Richey, in his *Lectures on Irish History*, presenting a translation of the Latin text to the lady pupils of the Alexandra College, makes the Pontiff to write: "You have signified to us, our well-beloved son in Christ, that you propose to enter the island of Ireland *in order to subdue the people*, etc. . . . We, therefore, regarding your pious and laudable design with due favour, etc., do hereby declare our will and pleasure, that for the purpose of enlarging the borders of the Church, etc., you do enter and *take possession of that island*." ¹ Such an erroneous translation must be the more blamed in the present instance, as it was scarcely to be expected that the ladies whom the learned lecturer addressed would have leisure to consult the original Latin text of the document which he professed to translate. This, however, is not the only error into which Professor Richey has been betrayed regarding the Bull of Adrian the Fourth. Having mentioned in a note the statement of Roger de Wendover, that the Bull was obtained from Pope Adrian in the year 1155, he adds his own opinion that "the grant appears to have been made in 1172." ² The learned lecturer seems to have forgotten that, at that date, Pope Adrian had been for about thirteen years freed from the cares of his Pontificate, having passed to the better world in the year 1159.

Second: Anyone who attentively weighs the words of the above document will see at once that it prescinds from all title of conquest, whilst at the same time it makes no gift or transfer to Henry the Second. As far as this letter of Adrian is concerned, the visit of Henry to our island might be the enterprise of a friendly monarch, who, at the invitation of a distracted commonwealth, would seek by his presence to restore peace, and to uphold the observance of the laws. Thus, all the foolish theories must at once be set aside, which rest on the groundless supposition that Pope Adrian authorised the invasion and plunder of the Irish people by the Anglo-Norman adventurers.

Third: There is another serious error which is sufficiently refuted by the simple perusal of the above document. I mean that opinion which would fain set forth the letter of Pope Adrian as a dogmatical definition of the Holy See, as if the Sovereign Pontiff then

¹ *Lectures on the History of Ireland*, by A. G. Richey, Esq., delivered to the Pupils of Alexandra College during the Hilary and Easter Terms of 1869. Dublin, 1869, pages 121, 123.

² *Ibid.*, page 121.

spoke *ex cathedra*, i.e., solemnly propounded some doctrine to be believed by the Universal Church; it proposes no matter of faith to be held by all the children of Christ; in fact, it presents no doctrine whatever to be believed by the faithful, and it is nothing more than a commendatory letter addressed to Henry, resting on the good intentions set forth by that monarch himself. There is one maxim, indeed, which awakens the suspicions of the old Gallican school, viz.: that "all the islands are subject to the authority of St. Peter." However, it is no doctrinal teaching that is thus propounded: it is a matter of fact admitted by Henry himself, a principle recognised by the international law of Europe in the middle ages, a maxim set down by the various states themselves, the better to maintain peace and concord among the princes of Christendom. To admit, however, or to call in question the teaching of the civil law of Europe, as embodied in that maxim, has nothing whatever to say to the great prerogative of St. Peter's successors, whilst they solemnly propound to the faithful, in unerring accents, the doctrines of Divine faith.

Fourth: To many it will seem a paradox, and yet it is a fact, that the supposed Bull of Pope Adrian had no part whatever in the submission of the Irish chieftains to Henry the Second. Even according to those who maintain its genuineness, this Bull was not published till the year 1175, and certainly no mention of it was made in Ireland until long after the submission of the Irish princes. The success of the Anglo-Normans was mainly due to a different cause, viz., to the superior military skill and equipment of the invaders. Among the Anglo-Norman leaders were some of the bravest knights of the kingdom, who had won their laurels in the wars of France and Wales. Their weapons and armour rendered it almost impossible for the Irish troops to meet them in the open field. The crossbow which was made use of for the first time in this invasion, produced as great a change in military tactics as the rifled cannon in our own days. When Henry came in person to Ireland his numerous army hushed all opposition. There were 400 vessels in his fleet, and if a minimum of twenty-five armed men be allowed for each vessel, we shall have an army of at least 10,000 men fully equipped landing unopposed on the southern shores of our island.¹ It is to this imposing force, and the armour of the Anglo-Norman knights, that we must in great part refer whatever success attended this invasion of the English monarch.

To proceed now with the immediate matter of our present historical inquiry. The following is the summary of the arguments in favour of the authenticity of Pope Adrian's letter, drawn up by J. C. O'Callaghan, Esq., editor of the *Macariæ Excidium*, and author of many valuable works on Irish history:—"We have, first, the testimony of John of Salisbury, secretary to the Archbishop of Canterbury, and one of the ablest writers of his day, who relates his having been the envoy from Henry to Adrian, in 1155, to ask for a grant of Ireland, and such a grant having then been obtained, accompanied by a gold ring, containing a fine

¹ The authorities for the statements made in the text may be seen in *Macariæ Excidium*, edited by Mr. O'Callaghan for the Irish Archaeological Society in 1850.

emerald, as a token of investiture, with which grant and ring the said John returned to Henry. We have, secondly, the grant or Bull of Adrian *in extenso* in the works of Giraldus Cambrensis and his contemporary, Ridulfus de Diceto, Dean of London, as well as in those of Roger de Wendover and Matthew Paris. We have, thirdly, several Bulls of Adrian's successor, Pope Alexander III., still further to the purport of Adrian's, or in Henry's favour. We have, fourthly, the recorded public reading of the Bulls of Adrian and Alexander at a meeting of Bishops at Waterford in 1175. We have, fifthly, after the liberation of Scotland from England at Bannockburn, and the consequent invitation of Bruce's brother, Edward, to be King of Ireland, the Bull of Adrian prefixed to the eloquent lay remonstrance, which the Irish presented to Pope John XXII., against the English; the same Bull, moreover, referred to in the remonstrance itself, as so ruinous to Ireland; and a copy of that Bull accordingly sent back by the Pope to Edward II. of England, for his use under those circumstances. We have, sixthly, from Cardinal Baronius, in his great work, the *Annales Ecclesiastici*, under Adrian IV., his grant of Ireland to his countrymen in full, or, as is said, 'ex codice Vaticano, diploma datum ad Henricum, Anglorum Regem.' We have, seventhly, the Bull in the *Bullarium Romanum*, as printed at Rome, in 1739. The citations and references in support of all the foregoing statements will be found in the 'Notes and Illustrations' of my edition of *Macariæ Excidium*, for the Irish Archæological Society in 1850, given in such a manner as must satisfy the most sceptical."

Examining these arguments in detail, I will follow the order thus marked out by Mr. O'Callaghan.

1. We meet, in the first place, the testimony of John of Salisbury, who in his *Metalogicus* (lib. iv., cap. 42), writes, that being in an official capacity at the Papal Court, in 1155, Pope Adrian IV. then granted the investiture of Ireland to the illustrious King Henry II. of England.¹

I do not wish in any way to detract from the praise due to John of Salisbury, who was at that time one of the ablest courtiers of Henry II. However, the words here imputed to him must be taken with great reserve. Inserted as they are in the last chapter of his work, they are not at all required by the context; by cancelling them the whole passage runs smooother, and is more connected in every way. This is more striking, as in another work of the same writer, which is entitled *Polycraticus*, we meet with a detailed account of the various incidents of his embassy to Pope Adrian, yet he there makes no mention of the Bull in Henry's favour, or of the gold ring and its fine emerald, or of the grant of Ireland, all of which would have been so important for his narrative.

We must also hold in mind the time when the *Metalogicus* was written. The author himself fixes its date; for, immediately before

¹ "Ad preces meas illustri regi anglorum Henrico Secundo (Adrianus) concessit et dedit Hiberniam jure hæreditario possidendam; sicut literæ ipsius testantur in hodiernum diem. Nam omnes insulæ, de jure antiquo, ex donatione Constantini qui eam fundavit et dotavit, dicuntur ad Romanam Ecclesiam pertinere, annulum quoque per me transmisit aureum, smaragdo optimo decoratum, quo fieret investitura iuris in gerenda Hibernia: idemque adhuc annulus in curiali archivo publico custodiri jussus est."

asking the prayers of "those who read his book, and those who hear it read," he tells us that the news of Pope Adrian's death had reached him a little time before, and he adds that his own patron, Theobald, Archbishop of Canterbury, though still living, was weighed down by many infirmities.¹ Now, Pope Adrian departed this life in 1159, and the death of Archbishop Theobald happened in 1161. Hence, Gale and the other editors of John of Salisbury's works, without a dissentient voice, refer *Metalogicus* to the year 1159.

Now, it is a matter beyond the reach of controversy, that if Henry II. obtained the investiture of Ireland from Adrian IV., he kept this grant a strict secret till at least the year 1175. For twenty years, *i.e.*, from 1155 to 1175, no mention was made of the gift of Adrian. Henry did not refer to it when authorising his vassals to join Diarmaid in 1167, when Adrian's Bull would have been so opportune to justify his intervention; he did not mention it when he himself set out for Ireland to solicit and receive the homage of the Irish princes; he did not even refer to it when he assumed his new title and accomplished the purpose of his expedition. The Council of Cashel, in 1172, was the first episcopal assembly after Henry's arrival in Ireland; the Papal Legate was present there, and did Adrian's Bull exist it should necessarily have engaged the attention of the assembled Fathers. Nevertheless, not a whisper as to Adrian's grant was to be heard at that famous Council. Even the learned editor of *Cambrensis Eversus*, whilst warmly asserting the genuineness of Adrian's Bull, admits "there is not any, even the slightest authority, for asserting that its existence was known in Ireland before the year 1172, or for three years later" (vol. ii., p. 440, note 2). It is extremely difficult, in any hypothesis, to explain in a satisfactory way this mysterious silence of Henry II., nor is it easy to understand how a fact so important, so vital to the interests of Ireland, could remain so many years concealed from those who ruled the destinies of the Irish Church. For, we must hold in mind, that throughout that interval Ireland numbered among its Bishops one who held the important office of Legate of the Holy See; the Irish Church had constant intercourse with England and the Continent, and through St. Laurence O'Toole and a hundred other distinguished prelates enjoyed in the fullest manner the confidence of Rome.

If Adrian granted this Bull to Henry at the solicitation of John of Salisbury in 1155, there is but one explanation for the silence of this courtier in his diary, as set forth in the *Polycraticus*, and for the concealment of this Bull itself from the Irish Bishops and people, *viz.*, that this secrecy was required by the state policy of the English monarch. And, if it be so, how then can we be asked to admit as genuine this passage of the *Metalogicus* in which the astute agent of Henry, still continuing to discharge offices of the highest trust in the Court, would proclaim to the world as early as the year 1159, that Pope Adrian had made this grant of Ireland to his royal master, and that the solemn record of the investiture of this high dignity was preserved in the public archives of the kingdom?

¹ *Metalogicus*, lib. iv. cap. ult.

It must be added that there are some phrases in this passage of the *Metalogicus* which manifestly betray the hand of the impostor. Thus, the words *usque in hodiernum diem* imply that a long interval had elapsed since the concession was made by Pope Adrian; and surely they could not have been penned by John of Salisbury in 1159. Much less can we suppose that this writer employed the words *jure hereditario possidendam*. No such hereditary right is granted in the Bull of Adrian. It was not dreamt of even during the first years of the Anglo-Norman invasion, and it was only at a later period, when the Irish chieftains scornfully rejected the Anglo-Norman law of hereditary succession, that this expedient was thought of for allaying the fierce opposition of the Irish people.

Thus we are forced to regard the supposed testimony of John of Salisbury as nothing more than a clumsy interpolation, which probably was not inserted in his work till many years after the first Anglo-Norman invasion of Ireland.

2. I now come to the second and main argument of those who seek to defend the authenticity of Pope Adrian's Bull. We have Giraldus Cambrensis, they say, a contemporary witness, whose testimony is unquestionable. He inserts in full this letter of Adrian IV., and he nowhere betrays the slightest doubt as to its genuineness.

Some years ago we might perhaps have been tempted to accept this flattering character of Giraldus Cambrensis, but at the present day, and since the publication of an accurate edition of his historical works, it is impossible for us to do so.

It was not till many years after the death of Pope Adrian that Gerald de Barry, better known as Giraldus Cambrensis, entered on the stage of Irish history. Twice he visited Ireland after the year 1183, and on both occasions he discharged those duties which, at the present day, would merit for him the title of special court correspondent with the invading army. The *Expugnatio Hibernica*, in which he inserts Adrian's Bull, may justly be said to have been written to order. Hence, as a matter of course, Giraldus adopted as genuine every document set forth as such by his royal master, and any statements that strengthened the claim or promoted the interests of his brother Welsh adventurers were surely not likely to be too nicely weighed in the scales of criticism by such an historian. The editors of the works of Giraldus, published under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, have fully recognised this special feature of the historical works of Giraldus. The official catalogue describing the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, of which we treat, expressly says: "It may be regarded rather as a great epic, than a sober relation of facts occurring in his own days. No one can peruse it without coming to the conclusion that it is rather a poetical fiction than a prosaic truthful history."

In the preface to the fifth volume of the Historical Treatises of Giraldus, the learned editor, Rev. James F. Dimock, enters at considerable length into the inquiry, whether the *Expugnatio Hibernica* was to be accepted as genuine and authentic history. I need do no more than state the conclusions which he enunciates:—

"I think I have said enough to justify me in refusing to accept

Giraldus's history of the Irish and of their English invaders as sober, truthful history."¹ And again he writes: "My good friend and pre-labourer in editing these volumes of Giraldus's works (Mr. Brewer) says of the *Expugnatio*, that Giraldus would seem to have regarded his subject rather as a great epic, which it undoubtedly was, than a sober relation of facts occurring in his own days. . . . This is a most true and characteristic description of Giraldus's treatment of his subject; the treatise certainly is, in great measure, rather a poetical fiction than a prosaic truthful history."²

I must further remark, as another result from Rev. Mr. Dimock's researches, that the old text of Giraldus in reference to Pope Adrian's Bull, from which Mr. O'Callaghan's citations are made, is now proved to be singularly defective. I shall give the pithy words of that learned editor, which are stronger than any I should wish to use: "*No more absurd nonsensical a muddle was ever blundered into by the most stupid of abbreviators.*"³ It is of course from the ancient MSS. of the work that this corruption of the old text is mainly proved; but it should indeed be apparent from an attentive study of the very printed text itself, for, as Mr. Dimock remarks, being accurately translated, its words "marvellously contrive to make Henry, in 1172, apply for and procure this privilege from Pope Adrian, who died in 1159, and with equally marvellous confusion they represent John of Salisbury, who had been Henry's agent in procuring this privilege in 1155, as sent, not to Ireland, but to Rome, for the purpose of publishing the Bull at Waterford in 1174 or 1175."

I shall only add, regarding the testimony of Giraldus Cambrensis, that in the genuine text of the *Expugnatio Hibernica* he places on the same level the Bull of Adrian IV. and that of Alexander III. Nevertheless, as we shall just now see, he elsewhere admits that there were many and grave suspicions that the supposed Bull of Alexander had never been granted by the Holy See.

The other names mentioned together with that of Giraldus will not detain us long. They are all writers who only incidentally make reference to Irish matters, and in these they naturally enough take Giraldus for their guide.

Ralph de Diceto wrote about 1210, and like Giraldus received his honours at the hands of Henry II. Irish historians have not yet accepted him as a guide in reference to matters connected with their country. For instance, the Synod of Cashel of 1172, which was one of the most important events of that period of Ireland's history, is described by him as held in Lismore.

Roger de Wendover was a monk of St. Albans, who died 6th of May, 1237. His *Floras Historiarum* begin with the creation of the world, and end two years before his death in 1235. He merely compendiates other sources down to the beginning of the thirteenth century. It is only the subsequent portion of his work which is held in esteem by English annalists.

¹ "*Giraldi Cambrensis Opera*," under the direction of the Master of the Rolls, vol. v., London, 1867. Preface, p. lxix.

² *Ibid.* p. lxx.

³ *Ibid.* p. xliii.

⁴ *Ibid.*

Matthew Paris was a brother religious of Roger de Wendover in St. Albans, where he died in 1259. Mr. Coxe, who edited a portion of the *Flores Historiarum* for the English Historical Society (1841-1844), has proved that down to the year 1235 Matthew Paris only compendiates the work of Wendover. At all events his *Historia Major* is of very little weight. A distinguished German historian of the present day, Scrhödl, thus conveys his strictures on its merits:—

“Se trompe a chaque instant, et, entraîné par son aveugle rage de critique, donne pour des faits historiques des anecdotes piquantes qui n'ont aucune authenticité, des légendes déraisonnables, et toutes sortes de détails suspects, exagérés et calomnieux.”

To the testimony of such writers we may well oppose the silence of Peter de Blois, secretary of Henry II., though chronicling the chief events of Henry's reign; and to this we may add the silence of all our native annalists, not one of whom ever mentions the Bull of Adrian.

3. But it is time to pass on to the third argument which is advanced by those who maintain the authenticity of the Bull. It is quite true that we have some letters or Bulls of Pope Alexander III. connected with the Irish invasion. Three of these, written in 1172, are certainly authentic. They are preserved in the *Liber Niger Scaccarii*, from which they were edited by Hearne, and in later times they have been accurately printed by Mr. O'Callaghan and Rev. Mr. Kelly. They are addressed respectively to the Irish bishops, King Henry, and the Irish princes. So far, however, are these letters from corroborating the genuineness of Pope Adrian's Bull, that they furnish an unanswerable argument for wholly setting it aside as groundless and unauthentic. They are entirely devoted to the circumstances of the invasion of our island and its results, and yet the only title that they recognise in Henry is “that monarch's power and the submission of the Irish chieftains.” They simply ignore any Bull of Adrian, and any investiture from the Holy See.

There is, however, we are told another Bull of Alexander III., preserved by Giraldus Cambrensis, which is supposed to have been granted at the request of King Henry in 1172, confirmatory of the gift and investiture made by Pope Adrian; and Mr. O'Callaghan holds that this Bull of Alexander III. sets at rest for ever all doubt as to the genuineness of the grant made by Adrian IV.¹

The question at once suggests itself:—Is this Bull of Alexander III. to be itself admitted as genuine and authentic? If its own authority be doubtful, surely it cannot suffice to prop up the tottering cause of Adrian's Bull. Now, its style is entirely different from that of the three authentic letters of which we have just spoken. Quite in opposition to these authentic letters, “the only authority alleged in it for Henry's right to Ireland is the Bull of Adrian,” as Dr. Lanigan allows.² The genuine letters are dated from Tusculum, where, as we know from other sources, Alexander actually resided in 1172. On the other hand, this confirmatory Bull, though

¹ *Macarise Excidium*, p. 247.
Eccles Hist. iv., 224.

supposed to have been obtained in 1172, is dated from *Rome*, thus clearly betraying the hand of the impostor. Such was the disturbed condition of Rome at that period that it was impossible for His Holiness to reside there; and hence we find him sometimes holding his Court in Tusculum, at other times in Segni, Anagni, or Ferrara. It was only when these disturbances were quelled that Alexander III. was able, in 1178, to return in triumph to his capital.¹

But there is still another reason why we must doubt of the authority of this confirmatory Bull. The researches of Rev. Mr. Dimock have proved what Üssher long ago remarked, that the Bull of Alexander originally formed part of the work of Giraldus Cambrensis,² although later copyists, and the first editors, including the learned Camden, recognising its spuriousness, excluded it from Giraldus's text. The matter is now set at rest, for the ancient MSS. clearly prove that it originally formed part of the *Expugnatio Hibernica*. Thanks, however, to the zeal and industry of Mr. Brewer, we are at present acquainted with another work of Giraldus, written at a later period than his Historical Tracts on Ireland. It is entitled *De Principis Instructione*, and was edited in 1846 for the Anglia Christiana Society. Now in this treatise Giraldus himself refers to the Bull of Alexander III., of which we treat, but he prefaces it with the following remarkable words*: "*Some assert or imagine that this Bull was obtained from the Pope; but others deny that it was ever obtained from the Pontiff.*" "*Sicut a quibusdam impetratum asseritur aut confingitur; ab aliis autem unquam impetratum fuisse negatur.*" Surely these words should suffice to convince the most sceptical that contemporary writers questioned the authenticity of this confirmatory Bull of Alexander III.

4. As regards the Synod of Waterford in 1175, and the statement that the Bulls of Adrian and Alexander were published therein for the first time, all these matters rest on the very doubtful authority of Giraldus Cambrensis. We have no record in the Irish Annals that any general meeting of the Irish Bishops was held in Waterford in 1175. The circumstances of the country rendered such a Synod impossible; for war and dissensions raged throughout the length and breadth of the land. It was in that year, however, that the first Bishop was appointed by King Henry to the See of Waterford, as Ware informs us; and, perhaps, we should not err were we to suppose that the Synod so pompously set forth by Giraldus was a convention of the Anglo-Norman clergy of Waterford under their newly-appointed Prelate, all of whom would, no doubt, joyfully accept the official documents presented in the name of the King by Nicholas of Wallingford.

Leland supposes that this Synod of Waterford was not held till 1177. The disturbed state of the kingdom, however, rendered a Synod equally impossible in that year, and all our ancient authorities utterly ignore such a Synod.

¹ Mozzoni, *Tavole Cronologiche*. Rome, 1867, ad an. 1179.

² *Opera Giraldi* vol. v., p. 318.

³ *De Princip. Instruct.*, p. 53.

5. In the Remonstrance addressed by the Irish princes and people to John XXII., about the year 1315, repeated mention is made of the Bull of Adrian. But then it is only cited there as a conclusive argument *ad hominem* against the English traducers of the Irish nation: "lest the bitter and venomous calumnies of the English, and their unjust and unfounded attacks upon us and all who support our rights, may in any degree influence the mind of your Holiness." The Bull of Adrian IV. was published by the English, and set forth by them as the charter-deed of their rule in Ireland, yet they violated in a most flagrant manner all the conditions of that Papal grant. The Irish princes and people in self-defence had now made over the sovereignty of the island to Edward Bruce, brother of the Scottish King; they style him their adopted monarch, and they pray the Pope to give a formal sanction to their proceedings. Thus, throughout the whole Remonstrance the Bull of Adrian is used as a telling argument against the injustice of the invaders, and as a precedent which John XXII. might justly follow in sanctioning the transfer of the Irish crown to Edward Bruce. If it was lawful for Adrian IV. to grant the kingdom to Henry II. under certain conditions, the King of England should not complain if another Pontiff were to transfer such a grant to the Prince of Ireland's choice, the conditions of the former pretended grant not having been fulfilled. But in all this the historian will find no grounds for asserting the genuineness of the supposed Bulls of Adrian or Alexander. We shall just now see that at this very time the Irish people generally regarded these Bulls as spurious and mere inventions of their English enemies.

6. Baronius, the eminent ecclesiastical historian, inserts in his invaluable *Annals* the Bull of Adrian IV., "from a Vatican Manuscript." This is the sixth argument advanced by Mr. O'Callaghan.

It is not my intention to question in any way the services rendered by Cardinal Baronius to the cause of our Church History; but at the same time no one will deny that considerable progress has been made in historical research during the past three hundred and fifty years, and many documents are now set aside which were then accepted as unquestioned on the supposed reliable authority of preceding chroniclers.

In the present instance we are not left in doubt as to the source whence Baronius derived his information regarding Adrian's supposed Bull. During my stay in Rome I took occasion to inquire whether the MSS. of the eminent annalist, which are happily preserved, indicated the special "Vatican Manuscript" referred to in his printed text, and I was informed by the then learned archivist of the Vatican, Monsignor Theiner, that the *Codex Vaticanus* referred to is a MS. copy of the history of Matthew Paris, which is preserved in the Vatican Library. Thus it is the testimony of Matthew Paris alone that here confronts us in the pages of Baronius, and no new argument can be taken from the words of the eminent annalist. Relying on the same high authority, I am happy to state that nowhere in the private archives or among the private papers of the Vatican, or in the *Regesta*, which Jaffe's researches have made so famous, or in the various indices of the Pontifical Letters, can

a single trace be found of the supposed Bulls of Adrian IV. and Alexander III.

7. The last argument advanced by Mr. O'Callaghan will not detain us long. The insertion or omission of such ancient records in the *Bullarium* is a matter that depends wholly on the critical skill of the editor. Curious enough, in one edition of the *Bullarium*, as may be seen in the references of Dr. Lanigan, Adrian's Bull is inserted, while no mention is made of that of Alexander; in another edition, however, the Bull of Alexander is given in full, whilst the Bull of Adrian is omitted. We may well leave our opponents to settle this matter with the conflicting editors of the *Bullarium*. They, probably like Baronius, merely copied the Bull of Adrian from Matthew Paris, and erred in doing so. Labbè, in his magnificent edition of the Councils, also publishes Adrian's Bull, but then he expressly tells us that it is copied from the work of Matthew Paris.

We have thus examined in detail the various arguments which support the genuineness of the supposed Bull, and now it only remains for us to conclude that there are no sufficient grounds for accepting that document as the genuine work of Pope Adrian.

Indeed the Irish nation at all times, as if instinctively, shrank from accepting it as genuine, and unhesitatingly pronounced it an Anglo-Norman forgery. We have already seen how even Giraldus Cambrensis refers to the doubts which had arisen concerning the Bull of Pope Alexander; but we have at hand still more conclusive evidence that Adrian's Bull was rejected by the Irish people. There is, happily, preserved in the Barberini archives, Rome, a MS. of the fourteenth century, containing a series of official papers connected with the Pontificate of John XXII., and amongst them is a letter from the Lord Justiciary and the Royal Council of Ireland, forwarded to Rome under the Royal Seal, and presented to His Holiness by William of Nottingham, Canon and Precentor¹ of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Dublin, about the year 1325. In this important, but hitherto unnoticed document, the Irish are accused of very many crimes, among which is insidiously introduced the rejection of the supposed Bulls: "*Moreover, they assert that the King of England under false pretences and by false Bulls obtained the dominion of Ireland, and this opinion is commonly held by them.*" "*Asserentes etiam Dominum Regem Angliæ ex falsa suggestionem et ex falsis Bullis terram Hiberniæ in dominium impetrasse ac communiter hoc tenentes.*" This national tradition was preserved unbroken throughout the turmoil of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and on the revival of Ireland's historical literature in the beginning of the seventeenth century, was registered in the pages of Lynch, Stephen White, and other writers.

It will be well also whilst forming our judgment regarding this supposed Bull of Adrian, to hold in mind the disturbed state of society, especially in Italy, at the time to which it refers. At the present day it would be no easy matter indeed for such a forgery to survive more than a few weeks. But at the close of the twelfth century it was far otherwise. Owing to the constant revolutions

¹ Cotton, in *Fasti Ecc. Hib.* gives his name as Precentor in 1323 to 1327.

and disturbances that then prevailed, the Pontiff was oftentimes obliged to flee from city to city ; frequently his papers were seized and burned, and he himself detained as a hostage or a prisoner by his enemies. Hence it is that several forged Bulls, examples of which are given in *Cambrensis Eversus*, date from these times. More than one of the grants made to the Norman families are now believed to rest on such forgeries ; and that the Anglo-Norman adventurers in Ireland were not strangers to such deeds of darkness appears from the fact that a matrix for forging the Papal Seal of such Bulls, now preserved in the Royal Irish Academy, was found a few years ago in the ruins of one of the earliest Anglo-Norman monasteries founded by De Courcy.

The circumstances of the publication of the Bull by Henry were surely not calculated to disarm suspicion. Our opponents do not pretend even that it was made known in Ireland till the year 1175, and hence, though publicly granted with solemn investiture, as John of Salisbury's testimony would imply, and though its record was deposited in the public archives of the kingdom, this Bull, so vital to the interests of the Irish Church, should have remained dormant for twenty years, unnoticed in Rome, unnoticed by Henry's courtiers, still more, unnoticed by the Irish Bishops, and I will add, unnoticed by the Continental Sovereigns, so jealous of the power and preponderance of the English monarch. For such suppositions there is indeed no parallel in the whole history of investitures.

It is seldom, too, that the hand of the impostor may not be detected in some at least of the minor details of the spurious document. In the present instance more than one ancient MS. preserves the concluding formula of the Bull : "*Datum Romae*"—*dated from Rome*. Now, this simple formula would suffice of itself to prove the whole Bull to be a forgery. Before the news of the election of Pope Adrian to the Chair of St. Peter could reach England, that Pontiff was obliged to seek for safety in flight from his capital. Rome was in revolt, and Arnold of Brescia sought to renew there a spectre of the old Pagan Republic. John of Salisbury, in his *Polycraticus*, faithfully attests that on his arrival in Italy, the Papal Court was held not in Rome, but in Beneventum ; it was in this city he presented to Pope Adrian the congratulations of Henry II., and he mentions his sojourn there during the three months that he remained in Italy. This is further confirmed by the Italian chronicles. Baronius saw the inconsistency of the formula, *Datum Romae*, with the date 1155, and hence, in his annals, he entered Adrian's Bull under the year 1159 ; but if this date be correct, surely then that Bull could not have been brought to Henry by John of Salisbury, and the passage of the *Metalogicus* referring to it must at once be admitted a forgery. Other historians have been equally puzzled to find a year for this supposed Bull. For instance, O'Halloran, in his *History of Ireland*, whilst admitting that the Irish people always regarded the Bull as a forgery, refers its date to the year 1167, that is, eight years after the death of Pope Adrian IV.

There is one other reflection which forces itself on us when reading Adrian's supposed Bull. The condition of Ireland, and

the relations between Ireland and the English King, which are set forth in the supposed Bull, are precisely those of the year 1172; but it would have required more than a prophetic vision to have anticipated them in 1155. In 1155 Ireland was not in a state of turmoil, or verging towards barbarism; on the contrary, it was rapidly progressing, and renewing its claim to religious and moral pre-eminence. I will add, that Pope Adrian, who had studied under Marianus, an Irish master, knew well this flourishing condition of Ireland. In 1172, however, a sad change had come over the island. Four years of continual warfare, and the ravages of the Anglo-Norman filibusters, since their first landing in 1168, had well nigh reduced Ireland to a state of barbarism, and the authentic letters of Alexander III, in 1172, faithfully describe its most deplorable condition.

Moreover, an expedition of Henry to Ireland, which would not be an invasion, and yet would merit the homage of the Irish princes, was simply an impossibility in 1155. But owing to the special circumstances of the kingdom, such in reality was the expedition of Henry in 1172. He set out for Ireland not avowedly to invade and conquer it, but to curb the insolence and to punish the deeds of pillage of his own Norman freebooters. Hence during his stay in Ireland he fought no battle and made no conquest; his first measures of severity were directed against some of the most lawless of the early Norman adventurers, and this more than any thing else reconciled the native princes to his military display. In return he received from a majority of the Irish chieftains the empty title of *Ard-riagh*, or "Head Sovereign," which did not suppose any conquest on his part, and did not involve any surrender of their own hereditary rights. Such a state of things could not have been imagined in 1155; and yet it is one which is implied in the spurious Bull of the much maligned Pontiff, Adrian the Fourth.

Since the publication of the above essay in November, 1872, several interesting papers have appeared treating of the subject in the fullest detail, some rejecting the Bull as a mere forgery, others presenting it as genuine and authentic.

Among the most determined opponents of the Bull I may mention the French writer, Rev. Louis Chaillot, in the *Analeccta Juris Pontificii* (Rome, May and June, 1882); Father Gasquet, O.S.B., in the *Dublin Review* (July, 1883); Stephen T. McCormick, in *The Pope and Ireland* (San Francisco, 1889); Canon Bellesheim, of Aix-la-Chapelle, in *The History of the Catholic Church in Ireland* (German edition, 1890); and Father W. B. Morris, of the London Oratory, in his interesting work, *Ireland and St. Patrick* (1891).

The genuineness of the Bull has been, on the other hand, stoutly maintained by the Rev. Sylvester Malone, in the *Dublin Review* (April, 1884); by Miss Norgate, in the *English Historical Review* (January, 1893); and by Alfred Tarleton, in his *Life of Nicholas Breakspeare* (London, 1896).

➤ Looking back upon the whole discussion, it appears to me that the arguments as set forth in my former essay remain unshaken.

Add to this that considerable light has been thrown on the circumstances of the times and other details which bring those arguments into bolder relief, and thus it becomes more and more evident that the supposed Bull was a mere clumsy forgery of the English monarch or his courtiers. I shall endeavour to compendiate in a few paragraphs the additional information which has been gleaned regarding this subject during the past twenty-five years.

(a) It is now very generally admitted that during the turmoil of the twelfth century, when there was question of local or personal interests, ambitious men did not shrink from the crime of forgery. The disturbed condition of Italy, and in particular of Rome, lent special facilities for falsifying the Papal documents, and made the detection of forgery proportionately difficult. Repeatedly the Popes were compelled to flee from Rome, whilst Arnolfo of Brescia or his disciples assumed the reins of government. Professor Jungman writes: "It is well known from history that everywhere towards the close of the twelfth century forged or corrupted Papal Letters or Diplomas were not uncommon. That such was the case in England is susceptible of proof from the Letters of John of Salisbury and of others. Richard, Archbishop of Canterbury, successor of St. Thomas à Beckett, instructed all the Bishops of England to promulgate in all their churches the severe sentence of excommunication against the public pest of forgery, so common had this crime become in the twelfth century. In the time of Pope Innocent III. also, various statutes were enacted against this abominable crime, which was becoming daily more widespread and dangerous." John of Salisbury's testimony sets this matter beyond all doubt. He expressly attests that the forger had been busy with the Letters of Pope Alexander III., and writing to that Pontiff (Epis. 129), he asks: "Nobis si placet rescribite qua animadversione ferendi sunt corruptores literarum vestrarum." Gervase, in his chronicle, at the year 1181, makes reference to "several rare and suspicious documents," which were produced about this time.

The question may now be asked, was Henry's character such as to free himself and his courtiers from all suspicion of having recourse to such forgeries, the better to attain his ends? The career of but few of the kings of England has been sketched for us in darker colours than that of Henry II. And the account comes to us not from later writers, but from contemporaries best acquainted with his perverseness and duplicity. St. Thomas of Canterbury did not hesitate to write that "from the first day of his accession to power, he has stretched out his hand against the liberties of the Church, as if they were his own hereditary right." Cardinal Vivian, Papal Legate in England and Ireland, speaking of the King, said, "Never did I witness this man's equal in lying." Louis of France declared to Henry's ambassadors that "their master was so full of fraud and deceit that it was impossible to keep faith with him" (Lingard, *Hist. of Eng.*, ii., p. 106, n.). This prepares us for the entry in the very accurate continuation of the Chronicle of Siebert, under the year 1171: "Henry, King of England, puffed up with pride, and usurping things not conceded, striving for things he had no business to do, prepared ships and called together the

soldiers of his kingdom to conquer Ireland" (Migne, *Patrol.*, cix., 307). The supposed Bull of Adrian would have been of no little value to Henry in his dealings with the Irish Bishops soon after the invasion. It gave some colour of justice to the course which he pursued, and afforded a plausible pretext to the courtiers to quell the opposition of those who on religious grounds might be unwilling to accept Henry's rule in Ireland.

(b) Father Morris of the London Oratory, in his interesting work, *Ireland and St. Patrick* (1891), dwells at considerable length on the unenviable character of the English King, which indeed is now unquestioned among the students of history, and he draws thence the conclusion that it is quite inconsistent with the whole career of Pope Adrian to suppose that such a Pontiff would assign to such a king the guardianship of the rights and liberties of the Irish Church. In reply to Father Morris's line of argument, Miss Norgate triumphantly appeals to the high opinion entertained by the English people of the character of their young Angevin King in the bright morning of his reign, the *English Chronicle* attesting that "all folk loved him, for he did good justice and made peace." This however, is not a sufficient reply to the argument of Father Morris. It is quite true that in the first months of his reign in 1154, he left nothing undone to ingratiate himself with the English people, and hence he was for a time idolized by them, but this did not prevent him from ambitioning at the very outset of his reign to grasp the rich domains of the Church and to crush her liberties, and from the letters of the Archbishop of Canterbury it is more than probable that those designs of Henry were well known at the Roman Court in the very first days of Adrian's Pontificate. The contemporary, Roger of Pontigny, under the year 1154, says that, when Henry succeeded to his ancestral kingdom, a great thirst for novelties arose in England. And no slight fear took hold of the Church of that country, as well because of the suspicious age of the king, as from the notorious malignity of his family in their dealings with the rights of ecclesiastical liberty." William of Canterbury writes in the same style, and describes this "malice of the king's designs" at the very outset of his reign, as well as the boldness of his ministers in "conspiring to strip the Church of her possessions."

(c) As the matter at present stands Giraldus Cambrensis is the sole witness on whose testimony we have to rely, whilst we accept as genuine the Bull of Pope Adrian. It is now admitted that Matthew Paris and other chroniclers merely copied the Bull from his pages. The question, therefore, may be asked: Is Giraldus a writer to whose testimony implicit credence can be given, particularly in matters relating to Irish history, or, on the other hand, may it be supposed that without much investigation or minute inquiry he accepted on the word of Henry's courtiers the supposed Bull as authentic and genuine? The sketch of the character of Giraldus in the preceding essay will enable the reader to form an accurate opinion as to the answer which should be given to such a question. The writer in the *English Historical Review*, on the other hand, contends that the testimony of Giraldus is unimpeachable, and criticises with no little severity the statement of

Father Morris, that Giraldus should be regarded as "the venal court historian of Henry II."

In proof of her contention Miss Norgate appeals to the unbending opposition of the King at the time when Giraldus applied for promotion to some rich benefices in Wales, and to the bitter enmity of Giraldus, as shown in many of his writings, towards Henry. However, the old maxim, *distingue tempora et conciliabis jura*, may here be very well applied. In the earlier years of Giraldus's career, when promotion to rich benefices in his native Wales was refused him, he wrote in a spirit of bitterest hostility to the King. And again towards the close of his life, when he sought to be promoted to the See of St. David's, and ambitioned other high Church preferment, the old bitterness of hostility to the royal court was revived. But at the period to which Giraldus's writings on Ireland must be referred, all this was changed. No one was more ready than he to alter his views according to the measure of royal patronage extended to him. At the time of which we treat Giraldus enjoyed the favour of Henry, and repaid with abject flattery the patronage of the King. In the *Dictionary of National Biography*, now in the course of publication, we read: "In 1184 Giraldus was made one of Henry II.'s chaplains, and was sent by the King to accompany his son John in his expedition to Ireland. He was offered whilst in Ireland the bishopricks of Wexford and Leighlin, and apparently at a little later time, the bishoprick of Ossory and the archbishoprick of Cashel, but declined them all. It is to this journey we owe the treatise *Topographia Hibernica*, dedicated to Henry II., which appeared in 1188. It gives an account of the general features of the country, its productions, climate, &c., mixed up with many marvellous stories. The *Expugnatio Hibernica*, which probably appeared the same year, dedicated to Richard (Strongbow), though containing much that is interesting and valuable, can scarcely be considered as sober, truthful history." (Vol. xxi., 390). The lack of critical acumen is seen in all Giraldus's writings. The history and antiquities of Wales were the favourite subjects of his studies. Nevertheless, of his chief work, *De Jure Menevensis Ecclesiae*, Mr. Brewer remarks that it exhibits "a strange mixture of antiquarian research with a total absence of all historical criticism." Giraldus dedicating his *Topographia* to Henry can hardly find words sufficient for the king's eulogy. He styles him the "Alexander of the West," the "Invincible," the "Solomon of his age," "the most pious of princes." Of Giraldus's slanderous attacks on Ireland one specimen will suffice. He deliberately sets forth that from the days of St. Patrick the Bishops of Ireland, without a solitary exception, had utterly neglected their sacred duties. The Anglican editor of his works, Rev. Mr. Dimock, remarks on this: "Giraldus was replete with the exact qualities the very reverse of what was needed to form an accurate historian. He asserts that from the time of St. Patrick there had never been a single Irish bishop who had manfully striven to instruct and correct the people, and this he asserts, though St. Malachy's fame could not possibly be unknown to him. St. Malachy had been dead only about forty years; and few, if any, more earnest and laborious instructors and reformers can perhaps

be named, among the bishops of all Christendom of all times, and he had contemporaries and followers not unworthy of him. And this, too, he asserts of the Isle of Saints, for ages after Patrick's time the great nursery of missionary Bishops, Apostles of the faith, throughout the wide district of the Continent of Europe, where the name of many an Irish saint and martyr is still held in reverence; to whom also was due the conversion of Scotland and of a large part of Saxon England." Dimock might have added that at the very time of the English invasion St. Laurence O'Toole was Archbishop of Dublin, whilst St. Gelasius ruled in Armagh, and St. Christian was Bishop of Lismore. The learned Ware was in many ways prejudiced against Ireland; nevertheless, in his *Antiquities of Ireland* (ch. xxiii.) he does not hesitate to write: "I cannot but express my surprise how men nowadays, otherwise grave and learned, have obtruded on the world the fictions of Giraldus for truths."¹

(d) In the preceding essay it is mentioned incidentally that Adrian's Bull was not allowed a place in Jaffe's *Regesta*. Since the publication of that essay a new edition of the *Regesta* has appeared in Germany, with the addition of Adrian's Bull. Interrogated on this matter, the editors have replied that this addition was made on the authority of a newly discovered manuscript exemplar of the Bull in the Vatican archives. Through the kindness of a very distinguished friend further inquiries were made at the Vatican, which elicited from Very Rev. Father Denifé, the present illustrious Vatican archivist, an attestation to the effect that when the papers formerly preserved in the Castle of San Angelo were examined a few years ago, a copy of the famous Bull was found; it was nothing more, however, than a transcript made in the fourteenth century, and was manifestly copied from the work of Matthew Paris. Such an addition, therefore, adds no evidence in favour of the authenticity of Adrian's Bull.

(e) In the lithographed edition of the *Leabhar Breac* (fifteenth century MS.), published by Royal Irish Academy, Adrian's Bull appears, as if it had originally formed part of that valuable collection of early records, and the reader would be led to suppose that its text was written by the same hand as the remainder of the MS. In the original MS., however, it is seen to be written by quite a different and more recent hand, on a vacant column, between two old Celtic tracts of the original compilation. When I collated the text, in the original venerable MS. in Trinity College, Dublin, Library, many years ago, the letters *Gir*, though partly effaced, were still legible at the foot of Adrian's Bull. This, I need scarcely remark, indicated Giraldus as the source whence the Bull had been derived.

(f) Some modern Protestant scribes in Ireland, following in the steps of Rev. Robert King (in *Primer of the Church History of Ireland*), have appealed to another passage in *Leabhar Breac*, in

¹ In regard to John of Salisbury, it may be remarked that after the death of Pope Adrian he fell into disgrace at Henry's Court. Nevertheless, in his many subsequent letters setting forth his merits, and defending himself against the displeasure of the King, he never thought of pleading the service he had rendered in obtaining the gift of Ireland.

proof that Adrian IV. sold Ireland to the English King. The passage referred to is as follows : " O'Annoc and O'Chalchin, of Kilmore, O'Sluaisi of Cooloslushty, and O'Glesain : these were they who stole the horses, and the mules, and the asses of the Cardinal who came from Rome to the Land of Erin to instruct in the time of Domhnall More O'Brien, King of Munster : and it was on that account the successor of Peter sold the rent and right of Erin to the Saxons : and that is the right and title which the Saxons hold on the Gaedhil at this day ; for it was to the successor of Peter, to Rome, used to go the rent and tribute of Erin till then."

This, however, is nothing more than a gossiping sentence, introduced by the scribe, having no historical weight, and having no connection whatever with the ancient tracts copied into the *Leabhar Breac*. Cardinal Vivian was the first Cardinal who visited Ireland during the reign of the famous Domhnall More O'Brien (whose death is recorded in 1194). Cardinal Vivian, however, did not visit Ireland till the year 1177, when the invasion of Ireland was an accomplished fact, and when more than twenty years had elapsed since the supposed grant of the kingdom was made by Adrian's Bull. Domhnall More O'Brien did not succeed to the throne till long after the death of Pope Adrian IV.

(g) It is not easy, however, to reconcile the course pursued in Ireland by Cardinal Vivian, Legate of Pope Alexander III., with the supposition that that Pontiff and his predecessor, Adrian, had by solemn Bull assigned the lordship of Ireland to King Henry II. He arrived in Ireland, as I have said, in 1177, and Roger de Hoveden tells of the King's rage because he knew him to be hostile to him. The chronicler adds that De Courcy made him prisoner in Ulster. William of Newbury further relates : " John De Courcy, having collected a powerful body of knights and foot soldiers, determined to invade Ulster, that province of Ireland which is separated from Scotland by a narrow strait. It happened that Vivian, the Legate of the Holy See, a man remarkable for his eloquence, had just then arrived in these parts from Scotland. He had been honourably received by the King of Ulster and the Bishops of the Province, and at the time was residing in the city of Down, near the sea. When the news arrived of the approach of the enemy, the Irish consulted the Legate on the course to be pursued in this emergency ; he answered that it was their duty to fight for their fatherland and their liberty, at the same time offering up public prayers for their success. Thus encouraged, they sallied forth impetuously " (*Gesta Angl.*, iii., 9). How different is this narrative from the account of Vivian's proceedings given in the Anglo-Irish Annals by Dowling : " Vivian, Cardinal of the title of St. Stephen in Monte Caelio, came into Ireland as Legate of the Apostolic See, with a commission from Pope Alexander to proclaim to the people the title and interests of their Lord the King of England in the Island of Ireland, with reservation of Peter's Pence, and also to denounce as excommunicated and accursed all that would resist the soldiers and agents of their lord the King, or that would refuse to supply them with victuals and food at a reasonable price." It is manifest that the same evil genius that dic-

tated the spurious Bull inspired also this Anglo-Norman record of Cardinal Vivian's mission.

(h) We may now advance a step further to search out some at least of the materials made use of by the King or courtier who concocted the pretended Bull of Pope Adrian.

There is a genuine Brief of the Pontiff, addressed to King Louis VII. of France, and dated the 12th of the Kalends of May, 1159. It has been published by Duchesne, *Rerum Franc. Scriptores*; Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens*; Bongar's *Gesta Dei per Francos*; Migne, *Patrologia*, vol. 188, and other writers.

Towards the close of the year 1158, the Bishop of Evreux, in Normandy, was dispatched to Rome by the French King to solicit the Pontiff's sanction for a joint expedition of French and English troops into the Spanish territory, to restore religion in those parts, and to free the faithful there from their worse than pagan oppressors. The Bishop of Evreux was born in England, and had been mainly instrumental in effecting, at this very period the reconciliation of the English and French monarchs, who in 1158, in token of their friendship, made a joint pilgrimage to the sanctuary of Mount St. Michael's, in Normandy. The friend of both monarchs, he represented both in his embassy to Rome, and pledged the hearty co-operation of Henry's army in the military crusade on which King Louis had set his heart. The Pontiff, however, refused his sanction, and in the Brief of 1159, whilst commending the motives which swayed the French monarch in devising this expedition, sets forth in detail the reasons why he felt constrained to refuse his sanction to it. From the nature of this correspondence the Brief referred to must have been unknown to the public at the period to which we refer, but on the other hand it must have been in due course communicated to the English King and his courtiers. Now the preamble of this Brief supplied abundant material for the forger for embodying in his Bull the Pontiff's ideas. We will here present in parallel columns a few phrases from both documents:—

FORGED BULL.

Laudabiliter satis et fructuose de glorioso nomine propagando in terris, et aeternae felicitatis praemio cumulando in coelis, tua magnificentia cogitatum ad dilatandos Ecclesiae terminos, &c., &c. . . sicut Catholicus princeps intendis, et ad id convenientius exequendum consilium Apostolicae Sedis exigit et favorem . . . ad bonum exitum et finem solent attingere quae de ardore fidei et religionis amore principium habuerunt, &c.

AUTHENTIC BRIEF OF 1159.

Satis laudabiliter et fructuose de Christiano nomine propagando in terris, et aeternae beatitudinis praemio tibi cumulando in coelis, tua videtur magnificentia cogitare, dum ad dilatandos terminos populi Christiani, &c. . . in H. properare intendis, &c., atque ad id convenientius exequendum, matris tuae sacrosanctae Romanae Ecclesiae consilium exigit et favorem, &c., ac de majori ardore fidei et religionis amore propositum et desiderium tuum principium habuerunt, &c.

Now, one thing at least is unquestionable in the matter of the

Pontifical Briefs, that the writers were masters of the Latin tongue, and most felicitous in varying the form of expression even when the same ideas had to be conveyed; and at no time was the Latin style of the Papal correspondence more classic or more jealously attended to than at the very period to which these Briefs refer. If we suppose that Adrian's Bull of the year 1155 be genuine, we shall have to admit in the Brief of 1159, such a copying of formulas and phrases as is without parallel in the authentic registers of the Papal Letters. And the anomaly becomes the greater when we consider that this copying of former documents would be found in a Brief addressed to the most powerful sovereign in Europe when treating of a matter of the greatest delicacy and importance, and conjointly with him to the very king to whom the former Bull had been addressed. As it is impossible to suppose that the Pontifical Secretary, in drawing up such a royal Brief of 1159, would have copied from a royal Bull of 1155; and as the Brief of 1159 is unquestionably genuine it follows that the Bull of 1155 must be set aside as spurious and of no authority.¹

(i) In the essay published twenty-five years ago I gave one instance in connection with Pope Adrian's Bull to illustrate the character of the "Lectures on Irish History," delivered by the Protestant professors in Ireland in those days. I may be allowed to cite another instance from a more recent work, in proof that the old methods of falsifying history still rule supreme in the Protestant University of Ireland. In 1889, Rev. Dr. Stokes, Professor of Ecclesiastical History in Trinity College, Dublin, published a volume of his lectures on "Ireland and the Anglo-Norman Church." The second lecture is devoted to Giraldus Cambrensis and the Bull of Adrian IV. He eulogises Giraldus as quite a model historian, and it is quite apparent that Dr. Stokes in his lectures, whilst decrying everything connected with the Catholic Church in Ireland, has taken Giraldus for his guide, philosopher, and friend. As regards the Bull of Pope Adrian, he assures his readers that the only argument advanced against it is "that no copy of the Bull has been found, or now exists in the Vatican archives." He exults in demolishing this visionary argument, which, however, none but himself has built up. I need scarcely remark that even the negative argument for rejecting the supposed Bull is far different from that suggested by Dr. Stokes. It is simply this: No Pontifical Bull or Brief can be accepted unless it be presented by some credible witness, whose authority may be sufficient to attest its genuineness. Now we have no such witness for Adrian's Bull. Here, however, Dr. Stokes declares the testimony of Giraldus in regard to Adrian's Bull to be quite irrefragable: "Giraldus had abundant means to satisfy himself (he says) as to the authenticity of the document. He lived for years at Rome, he had continual access to the Papal Registers, which he carefully investigated. . . . Giraldus had no

¹ I do not deem it necessary to make special reference to the ingenious theory devised by Chailiot, to the effect that the Pontifical Brief of 1159 had reference not to Spain but to Ireland. The only apparent argument in favour of this theory is that in the proper names *Hibernia* and *Hispania*, the initial capital letter is the same. Few, however, will be convinced by such an argument, the more so as the whole context of the Brief has manifest reference to the condition of Spain in those days.

conceivable motive for forging this Bull in favour of a king he hated, and who had mortally injured him." The only proof for Giraldus's acquaintance with the Roman Registers is the Rev. Professor's vivid imagination. It is not at all necessary to suppose that the Bull was forged by Giraldus. Any other courtier may be responsible for that serious crime. His uncritical frame of mind made it particularly easy to impose such fraudulent documents on him. He tells us himself that he made four journeys to Rome, but it was between the years 1199 and 1203. His one ambition in these journeys was to obtain the See of St. David's, and the forged Bulls had already been many years published. He presented to the Court in Rome several of his works which he names, but in that list we search in vain for the *Expugnatio Hibernica*, which contained the forged Bulls. As regards Giraldus's hatred of the King at the period of which we treat it is a mere dream of Rev. Professor Stokes. I have already given sufficient proof of the abject flattery of the English King, which characterises Giraldus's writings on Ireland. It may be added that Giraldus dedicated the *Topographia Hibernica* to King Henry, and when a second edition was brought out after the King's death, he prefixed a letter addressed to John, the Lord of Ireland, in which he declares that his object in writing those works on Ireland was to sound King Henry's praises, *in laudem regis*.

(h) It may now be asked was the Church of Ireland at the time of the accession of Pope Adrian IV. in that desolate condition of decay and barbarism which is set forth in the supposed Bull. The one witness to the decay of religion and morality in Ireland in the beginning of the twelfth century to whom the champions of the authenticity of Adrian's Bull appeal is St. Bernard. But this same venerable witness attests that, through the exertions of St. Malachy, the weeds of vice had been plucked out and Christian civilization restored, religious faith had been revived throughout the length and breadth of the land, and Christian virtues were preached, so that at the time of the saint's death in 1148 the Irish Church was arrayed in its pristine splendour. Speaking of St. Malachy, St. Bernard says that when he visited Pope Eugene III. in Rome, "the Sovereign Pontiff on many occasions, and with great care, made inquiries concerning the state of the Church in his country, and when he was preparing to depart, authorised him to act for him throughout the whole of Ireland; and taking the mitre from his head, he placed it on that of Malachy, giving him also the stole and maniple, which he used in offering the Holy Sacrifice." St. Bernard adds that Malachy was not slow in carrying out the wishes of the Pontiff: "It is not the receiving of honour that engages his attention, but rather the execution of the duties belonging to his Legateship. In various places various conventions are held, so that no district, or part of a district, should be left without the fruits and advantages of his legatine office. The seed is sown upon all waters; there is no one able to hide himself from the influence of his anxious care. Not sex, not age, not condition, not profession enters into his calculations. Among all alike the health-giving seed is scattered; among all alike the heavenly trumpet sends forth its note. . . . Religion is planted,

propagated, cherished in every quarter. In the Councils, which are celebrated in all parts of the land, traditions of ancient date are revived; new ones are also devised. And all appointments promulgated by him, like decrees issued from heaven itself, are adopted, enforced, and secured in written records, in order to their preservation for posterity." This, however, is a theme on which it is not necessary to dwell at any length. Suffice it to say that the Bishops of Ireland throughout the period were men according to St. Malachy's own heart, and enjoyed in the fullest measure the confidence of the Holy See. In token of perfect order being restored in the Irish Church, and of the confidence placed in the Irish Bishops by Rome, Cardinal John Paparo was sent to Ireland in 1152, only two years before Pope Adrian's accession, and in the National Synod, held at Kells, in the presence of the Irish Bishops and of 300 priests, and of very many of the princes and chieftains of Erin, he solemnly granted to the four archbishops the Blessed Pallium for which St. Malachy had so earnestly pleaded. From the letters of Adrian the Fourth and his immediate successors it is manifest that the conferring of the Pallium in those days was regarded as the highest honour and most distinctive proof of singular esteem and favour that the Holy See could confer upon any National Church. Such an estimate of the Irish Church in Rome is quite inconsistent with the picture of its deformity which the supposed Bull of Adrian presents.

✠ PATRICK F. CARD. MORAN.

No. 2.

LETTER OF POPE ADRIAN IV. TO KING LOUIS VII.,
DISSUADING HIM FROM THE IRISH EXPEDITION.

Adrianus episcopus, servus servorum Dei, charissimo in Christo filio Ludovico illustri Francorum Regi, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Satis laudabiliter et fructuose de Christiano nomine propagando in terris, et æternæ beatitudinis præmio tibi cumulando in cœlis, tua videtur magnificentia cogitare, dum ad dilatandos terminos populi Christiani, ad paganorum barbariem debellandam, et ad gentes apostatras, et quæ catholicæ fidei refugiunt nec recipiunt veritatem, christianorum jugo et ditioni subdendas, simul cum charissimo filio nostro Henrico illustri Anglorum rege, in H. properare disponis, et studes assidue (ut opus hoc felicem exitum sortiatur) exercitum et quæ sunt itineri necessaria congregare. Atque ad id convenientius exsequendum, matris tuæ sacrosanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ consilium exis et favorem. Quod quidem propositum tanto magis gratum acceptumque tenemus, et amplius sicut commendandum est commendamus, quanto de sinceriori charitatis radice talem intentionem et votum tam laudabile proces-

sisse credimus, ac de majori ardore fidei et religionis amore propositum et desiderium tuum principium acceperunt.

Verum cum excellentia tua et consilii maturitate sit provida, et luce illustrata, in ordine ipsius facti videtur plurimum esse festina. Unde et multos attonitos reddidit, et suspensos, cum omne bonum quod suo tempore et competenti ordine exerceatur, æterno Conditori placitum habeatur modis omnibus et acceptum, aliter autem non potest gratum ejus existere voluntati. Quod utique ut magis appareat, et ut sit quod proponimus paulo amplius manifestum, aliquid exempli gratia duximus, non inutiliter supponendum. Corpus quidem Christi conficere, et in ara Dominica hostiam immolare, rectum, imo et salutiferum esse, nemo qui recte sapit ignorat. Cæterum si tempore suo et horis immolatum non fuerit constitutus, jam illud reservatur ad pœnani quod expectebatur ad gloriam; et qui extra tempus immolat constitutum, inde sibi damnationem dolebit infligi: unde, si constituto tempore immolasset, meritum sibi gauderet et præmium augmentari.

Accedit ad hoc quod alienam terram intrare nec providum, videtur esse, nec tutum, nisi a principibus et a populo terræ prius consilium requiratur. Tu vero, sicut accepimus, inconsulta Ecclesia, et principibus terræ illius, accedere illuc et festinare disponis, cum hoc deberes nulla ratione tentare, nisi cognita per principes terræ necessitate, et ab eis prius esses exinde requisitus. Unde quia nos honorem et incrementum tuum tota mentis intentione diligimus, et nihil tale te aggredi, nisi rationabili causa exigente, vellemus, sublimitati tuæ præsentibus litteris suademus ut prius necessitatem terræ per principes illius regni inspicias, et consideres, et tam illius Ecclesiæ quam principum et populi voluntatem diligenter inquiras, et ab eis consilium, sicut decet, accipias. Quo facto, si et necessitatem terræ videris imminere et Ecclesiæ consilium fuerit, ipsi etiam terræ principes tuæ sublimitatis auxilium postulaverint, et consilium dederint, juxta postulationem et consultum eorum poteris postea in facto ipso procedere, et laudabile votum tuum, divino comitante præsidio, adimplere. Aliter tamen timendum esset, ne iter tuum infructuosum existeret, et ne ad desideratum non posset exitum pervenire. Ipsi vero principes et populus in tanto apparatu tuo, si forte non necessitas incumberet, gravarentur, et nos ipsi leves in hoc facto possemus multipliciter apparere.

Debet enim serenitatis tuæ celsitudo recolere, et ad memoriam revocare, qualiter alio tempore, cum tam Conradus bonæ memoriæ quondam rex Romanorum, quam tu ipse, inconsulto populo terræ, Hierosolymitanum iter minus caute aggressi estis, speratum fructum et optatum commodum non perceperitis, et quantum Ecclesiæ Dei et universo fere populo Christiano detrimentum exinde provenerit et jactura. Sane quoque Romanæ Ecclesiæ, quia vobis super hoc consilium præstiterat et favorem, in ipso facto fuit non modicum derogatum; et omnes adversus ipsam ex multa indignatione clamabant, dicentes, eam auctricem tanti periculi exstitisse.

Cum igitur hæc omnia sollicitè cogitantibus occurrerent formidanda, nos admonitionem et exhortationem apostolicam ad populum regni tui, secundum quod venerabilis frater R. Ebroidensis episcopus nobis ex tua parte proposuit, duximus differendam. Attendentes quoniam quod differtur ad tempus, penitus non aufer-

tur. Sed tunc tandem exhortatorias et commonitorias litteras in peccatorum remissionem juxta desiderium gloriæ tuæ, auctore Domino, transmittimus, cum de consilio et postulatione tam principum quam populi terræ illius, sicut superius dictum est, volueris iter arripere, et conceptum in animo votum necessitatis tempore, cum forte modo aliqua necessitas non immineat, discrete ac laudabiliter disposeris adimplere.

Litteras autem, in quibus regnum tuum sub beati Petri et nostra protectione susciperemus, his qui regnum ipsum usque ad reditum tuum præsumerent impugnare, iram et indignationem apostolicam proponentes, secundum petitionem regiæ dignitatis nec ad præsens duximus concedendas. Nos etiam, te etiam reticente, et a nobis nullatenus exigente, pro illius fervore dilectionis quam erga tuam sublimitatem habemus, quidquid honoris et exaltationis tibi et regno tuo exhibere possemus, prompto animo curaremus efficere, et operibus adimplere. Sane discretio tua et nostram dissuasionem, quam rationabiliter credimus nos fecisse, provida deliberatione consideret, atque alia per quæ ad illud iter tam festinanter aspiras, inspiciat et attendat. Et illud tandem tibi consilium super negotio ipso eligas, quod magis de iudicio rationis cognoveris eligendum.

De cætero, ea quæ memoratus frater noster episcopus ex nostra parte regiæ proposuerit dignitati, velut si ab ore nostro procederent, absque ulla hesitatione suscipias, et ipsius verbis, tanquam si contingeret nos ea proferre, fidem non dubites adhibere. Ille namque injunctam sibi legationem ita prudenter fuit et sollicitè exsecutus, quod omne illud a nobis studio suæ probitatis et discretionis obtinuit, quidquid per sollicitam et providam vigilantiam debuerit quilibet alius obtinere.

Datum Laterani XII Kalen. Martii.

(Bongars, *Gesta Dei per Francos*, p. 1174; André Duchesne, *Rerum Francicarum Scriptores*, t. iv., p. 557; Dom Bouquet, *Recueil des Historiens de France*, t. 15; Migne, *Patrologie*, t. 188, col. 1615.)

No. 3.

FROM CHAPTER XLII. OF THE *METALOGICUS*, LIB. IV.

Sed hæc hactenus. Jain enim flere magis vacat, quam scribere : et visibili argumento doceor quod mundus totus subjacet vanitati. Expectavimus enim pacem, et ecce turbatio et tempestas ingruens Tolosanis, Anglos et Gallos undique concitat, et reges, quos amicissimos vidimus, se insatiabiliter persequuntur. Ad hæc, mors Adriani summi pontificis, cum omnes christianæ religionis populos nationesque perturbaverit, Angliam nostram, unde fuerat oriundus, acerbiori dolore commovit, irrigavitque lacrymis profusioribus, *Omnibus ille bonis flebilis occidit, sed nulli flebilior, quam mihi.* Cum enim matrem haberet et fratrem uterinum : me, quam illos, arctiori diligebat affectu. Fatebatur, et publice et secreto, quod

me præ omnibus mortalibus diligebat. Eam de me conceperat opinionem, ut quoties opportunitas aderat, conscientiam suam in conspectu meo effundere læteretur. Et cum romanus pontifex esset, me in propria mensa gaudebat habere convivam; et eundem scyphum et discum, sibi et mihi volebat, et faciebat, me renitente, esse communem. Ad preces meas illustri regi Anglorum, Henrico secundo, concessit et dedit Hiberniam jure hæreditario possidendam, sicut litteræ ipsius testantur in hodiernum diem. Nam omnes insulæ, de jure antiquo, ex donatione Constantini, qui eam fundavit et dotavit, dicuntur ad Romanam Ecclesiam pertinere. Annulum quoque per me transmisit auream, smaragdo optimo decoratum, quo fieret investitura juris in gerenda Hibernia: idemque adhuc annulus in curiali archivio publico custodiri jussus est. Si virtutes ejus percurrere velim, in magni voluminis librum, hæc una excrescet materia. Omnium vero mentes magis exulcerat scissura Ecclesiæ, quæ, exigentibus culpis nostris, contingit tanto patre sublato, . . . Publici doloris expono causas: cum aliunde familiarius dolore torquear, tum non leviori, quod ad me spectat. Siquidem pater meus et dominus immo et tuus, venerabilis Theobaldus, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus in ægritudine incidit: ut incertum sit, quidquid sperare oporteat. Negotiis more solito superesse non potest: injunctæ provinciam duram, et importabile onus imposuit, omnium ecclesiasticorum sollicitudinem. Anxiatur ergo undique in me spiritus meus, et cruciatus quos patior, non sufficio enarrare. Sed in his omnibus, unicuique mihi consilium superest, Deum hominem, intemeratæ Virginis filium, exorare, etc.

No. 4.

APOCRYPHAL BULL ATTRIBUTED TO POPE ADRIAN IV.

Adrianus episcopus, servus servorum Dei, carissimo in Christo filio illustri Anglorum regi salutem et apostolicam benedictionem. Laudabiliter satis et fructuose, de glorioso nomine propagando in terris, et æternæ felicitatis præmio cumulando in cœlis, tua magnificentia cogitat; dum ad dilatandos ecclesiæ terminos, ad declarandum indoctis et rudibus populis christianæ fidei veritatem, et vitiorum plantaria de agro dominico extirpanda, sicut catholicus princeps intendis; et ad id convenientius exequendum, consilium apostolicæ sedis exigit et favorem. In quo facto, quanto altiori consilio et majori discretionem procedis, tanto in eo feliciorum progressum te, præstante Domino, confidimus habiturum; eo quod ad bonum exitum et finem soleant attingere, quæ de ardore fidei, et religionis amore, principium acceperunt. Sane Hiberniam, et omnes insulas, quibus sol justitiæ Christus illuxit, et quæ documenta fidei christianæ ceperunt, ad jus beati Petri et sacrosanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, quod tua etiam nobilitas recognoscit, non est dubium pertinere. Unde tanto in eis libentius plantationem fidelem et germem gratum Deo inserimus, quanto id a nobis interno

examine districtius prospicimus exigendum. Significasti siquidem nobis, fili in Christo carissime, te Hiberniæ insulam, ad subdendum illum populum legibus et vitiorum plantaria inde extirpanda, velle intrare; et de singulis domibus annuam unius denarii beato Petro velle solvere pensionem, et jura ecclesiarum illius terræ illibata et integra conservare. Nos itaque, pium et laudabile desiderium tuum cum favore congruo prosequentes, et petitioni tuæ benignum impendentes assensum, gratum et acceptum habemus, ut pro dilatandis Ecclesiæ terminis, pro vitiorum restringendo decursu, pro corrigendis moribus et virtutibus inserendis, pro christianæ religionis augmento, insulam istam ingrediaris, et quæ ad honorem Dei et salutem illius terræ exequaris; et illius populus honorifice te recipiat, et sicut dominum veneratur. Jure nimirum ecclesiarum illibato et integro permanente, et salva beato Petro, et sacrosanctæ romanæ Ecclesiæ, de singulis domibus annua unius denarii pensione. Si ergo quod concepisti animo, effectu duxeris prosequente complendum, stude gentem illam bonis moribus informare; et agas tam per te, quam per illos quos ad hoc fide, verbo, et vita, idoneos esse prospexeris, ut decoretur ibi ecclesia, plantetur et crescat fidei christianæ religio, ut quæ ad honorem Dei et salutem pertinent animarum (per te) taliter ordinentur, ut a Deo sempiternæ mercedis cumulum consequi merearis, et in terris gloriosum nomen in seculis obtinere.

(No date. In Ussher and in Lynch there is: "Datum Romæ," etc.)

(We take the Apocryphal Bull from the late edition of *Giraldus Cambrensis*, vol. v., p. 317.)

No. 5.

REMARKS OF MR. BREWER AND REV. MR. DIMOCK ON *GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS*.

(London Edition, 1861-1867.)

"Leave us to regret that a quality of mind so valuable had not been strengthened by a more sober and regulated judgment. The only drawback is the recurrence of artificial orations, which Giraldus, following the Latin and some later historians, has thought fit to put in the mouths of his heroes. References to Julius Cæsar and quotations from Ovid sound strangely from the lips of Irish chiefs. . . The Greek terminations of their names give also something of a ridiculous (*v.g.* Stephanides for Fitz-Stephen, Morcadides, Geraldides, &c.)."—(*Opera Geraldii Cambrensis*, Vol. i., p. xlvi.).

"In the fifth chapter of the second book the early manuscripts give, under the year 1174 or 1175, a privilege long before obtained from Pope Adrian IV. authorizing Henry II.'s invasion of Ireland, and a confirmatory one of the then Pope, Alexander III., with some prefatory matter principally relating to the persons employed in bringing the privilege for publication into Ireland at this time,

and to the agency of John of Salisbury in having procured the first from Pope Adrian IV. in 1155. All this in the early manuscripts is clear and consistent, agreeing perfectly, moreover, with the evidence of contemporary authorities, and as regards the account of the procuring of Adrian's privilege fully corroborated by John of Salisbury himself. But the later manuscripts omit Alexander's privilege and all mention of him, and give Adrian's privilege only. The prefatory matter had to be altered accordingly. In doing this they marvellously contrive to make Henry in 1172 apply for and procure the privilege from Pope Adrian, who died in 1159; and with equally marvellous confusion, they represent John of Salisbury who had been Henry's agent in procuring the privilege in 1155, as sent, not to Ireland, but to Rome, for the purpose of publishing it at Waterford in 1174 or 1175. But the cause of the suppression and the germ of the blundering in the prefatory matter were both perhaps supplied by Giraldus, in his copy of this chapter as given in the *De Inst. Princ.* He there states, in introducing Alexander's privilege, that some asserted it to be a forgery; and hence, perhaps, its suppression afterwards in the *Expugnatio* by some rectifier of his history of Henry's Papal rights over Ireland. And in the prefatory matter, by what is evidently a mere accidental mistake, he puts Adrian instead of Alexander, as granting the privilege in 1172; thus giving, perhaps, no small beginning for all the after blundering of his rectifier of history."—(*Ibid.*, Vol. v., Preface, xlii., pp. 315, 318.)

"Any suppression of them afterwards is extremely unlikely: his bitter disgust with Henry and his sons in his later years, as displayed vindictively and fearlessly in the *De Instr. Principis*, was anything but the feeling to induce him to drop anything offensive."—(*Ibid.*, p. xlv.)

"I think I have said enough to justify me in refusing to accept Giraldus's history of the Irish and of their English invaders as sober, truthful history."—(*Ibid.*, p. lxix.)

"Truth was not his main object; he says that he compiled the work for the purpose of sounding the praises of Henry II. In his letter to King John: 'Topographiam Hibernicam, &c., in patris vestri laudem triennii labore digessi.' One main object of the *Expugnatio* was certainly the glorification of himself and his relations."—(*Ibid.*, p. lxx.)

"The treatise certainly is, in great measure, rather a poetical fiction than a prosaic truthful history,' &c. Brewer will, perhaps, think me foolish and presumptuous, but I am sure he will not be offended, when I say that I cannot further agree with him in considering this a trivial defect in the case of historical narration. It may be that the poetical fiction is confined to certain portions of the treatise, and that other portions are prosaic truth, but how are we to know where the one ends and the other begins? How can we be sure that the poetry, which undoubtedly pervades some portions does not more or less infect all other portions, however much they may look like honest prose."—(*Ibid.*, p. lxxi.)

"Mr. Brewer reflects upon the absurd orations, which Giraldus puts into the mouths of his heroes. No more ridiculous absurdities of the sort, are perhaps, anywhere to be found. And not the least

grandiloquent of them are bestowed on a most unworthy occasion. The orations of Roderic, Dermot Mac Murrough, and Fitz Stephen, if any one has the patience to read them, can only seem the prelude to a hard-fought field and a glorious decisive victory; but nothing follows except a few lines about a hollow short-lived truce. Giraldus was well acquainted with Horace's *De Arte Poetica*; he very frequently quotes it; but there is one wise bit of advice in it to poetical writers that he can have taken little note of; there never was a more absurd instance than this of his, of a mountain in labour and a 'ridiculus mus.'—(*Ibid.*, p. lxxi.)

"I can name scarcely any of our English historians who made use of these treatises of Giraldus within 300 years or more after his time; but I have a very imperfect acquaintance with writers after the thirteenth century. So far as I have seen, our writers during those 300 years were not at all given to enter largely on earlier Irish matters; if mentioning older Irish history at all, most of them were content with transcribing or condensing what little they found in Hoveden, or William de Newburg, or others of the writers of more general history, and were but little likely to meddle with Giraldus's Irish treatises, even if they were acquainted with them.

"Higden, however, who, in his account of Henry II., certainly makes use of our author's *De Instruc. Princip.*, seems also in one instance, if not more, to quote from the *Expugnatio*"; also, in speaking of the Council of Cashel, he introduces the white cow of Archbishop Gelasius. Brompton has this also, in a passage taken generally from Hoveden, but he seems to have derived it from Higden."—(*Ibid.*, p. lxxviii.)

"Recent Irish scholars have quietly received Giraldus for what he is worth, as an impetuous, strongly biassed writer, whose statements have generally more or less of truth in them, but with much unfair one-sidedness, . . . Some late Irish writers, under the reaction perhaps of his having been found too much fault with, seem to me to put more faith in Giraldus's history than it really deserves."—(*Ibid.*, p. lxxxii.)

"This chapter is repeated in the *De Instructione Principum*, ii., 19 (page 51). In the later manuscripts, *Cleopatra*, &c., and Camden, as will be seen, it appears in a strangely mutilated form. They omit Pope Alexander's privilege; do not even mention him; make Adrian's privilege, who died in 1159, to be now granted after the year 1171. Hooker's translation, published several years before Camden's volume, contains both privileges, as in the early manuscripts. Ussher, in 1632 (*Epist. Hibern. Sylloge*, Nos. 46 and 47), printed the two privileges from two manuscripts of the *Expugnatio*."—(*Ibid.*, pp. 315, and cv.)

No. 6.

REMARKS OF GIRALDUS CAMBRENSIS ON THE BULL OF
POPE ADRIAN.

Quatenus ea duo, quæ pater vester Adriano papæ pepigerat olim, propter licentiam impetrandam intrandi in Hiberniam et expugnandi, prudenter et discrete sibi suisque providens, cum supremam in terris tanti tamque cruenti in Christianos aggressus auctoritatem sibi comparavit; scilicet Ecclesiam Dei in finibus illis exaltare, et denarium annuum de singulis domibus beato Petro, sicut in Anglia, sic et in Hibernia dare; juxta tenorem privilegii ejusdem papæ super hoc a patre vestro prudenter et circumspecte perquisiti, et in archivio Wintoniæ fideliter repositi.

Propter hæc etenim promissa sed hactenus omissa, duos ibi, tanquam ultione divina, credibile est defectus accidisse: quod (scilicet) tam diu efficacia conquestus illius, et consummabilis utilitas est dilata; et quod primi ac præcipui terræ illius expugnatores . . . legitimam de carne sua prolem suscipere non meruerunt.

Nec mirum. Mendicat enim miser in insula clerus: lugent ecclesiæ cathedrales, terris suis et prædiis amplis, quondam sibi fideliter et devote collatis, a prædictis et aliis vel cum ipsis, vel post ipsos advectis, spoliata. Et sic Ecclesiam exaltare verum est ibi in ecclesias spoliare. Et ut in aliquo tam cruenti questus hujus et conquestus particeps Deus existat promissus census ille, modicus satis atque modestus, omnes quippe liberans et neminem gravans, de cetero detur.

Item eadem impatientia et hoc adjicimus, quatenus in memoriam expugnationis hujus Hibernicæ per Anglos factæ . . . in annuo auri, vel avium—vel etiam arborum tributo firmiter statuto, quasi perpetuo chirographo et indisolubili vinculo, regnum Hibernicum Anglicanæ coronæ subjactum omni palam tempore fiat.—(Letter to King John, from the latest edition of *Expugnatio Hibernica*, Vol. v., p. 408.)

Propter causas in libro *Expugnationis Hibernicæ* a Giraldo conscriptas non profecit (Johannes Comes). Quarum etiam tres urgentissimas et hic inserere dignum duxi. Prima fuit, quod cum in Saracenos potius ad Terræ Sacræ subventionem mitti deberet, missus est in christianos. Secunda quod juvenis et puer ipse juvenum quos secum duxit, qui ibi ignoti fuerant penitus et ignari, consiliis utens, probos viros et discretos ibi repertos, qui mores et modos gentis et patriæ cognoscebant, tanquam extraneos et indignos repellebat.

Tertia vero, quæ quidem omnium pessima fuerat, quod Deo et Ecclesiæ suæ nullum in partibus honorem facere disponebat, sicut ex visione quam tunc vidit Giraldus et in prædicto *Expugnationis Hibernicæ* libro posuit, palam apparuit. Quamquam tamen propter hoc præcipue, ut ecclesiam hibernicam extolleret et exaltaret, et denarium sancti Petri sicut in Anglia sic in Hibernia dari faceret, pater ipsius intrandi Hiberniam sibi subjugandi ab Ecclesia Romana licentiam impetravit: quemadmodum ex

privilegio Adriani super hoc obtento aperte declaratur. Cujus transcripsum, sicut in *Expugnationis* libro illius positum est, simul cum visione illa verbis eisdem hic apponere præter rem non putavi.—(*De Rebus a se Gestis*, Op., Vol. i., p. 61.)

No. 7.

DIPLOMA FROM CLEMENT III.

(1188.)

Clemens episcopus etc. Juxta commendabile desiderium charissimi Anglorum regis, fraternitati tuæ legationis officium in tota Anglia et Wallia tam per Cantuariensem, quam per Eboracensem archiepiscopatum; et in illis Hiberniæ partibus, in quibus nobilis vir Joannes comes Moretonii frater ipsius regis potestatem habet et dominium: auctoritate apostolica duximus committendum. Datum nonis junii, pontificatus nostri anno tertio.—(Math. Paris, an. 1188.)

No. 8.

LETTER OF POPE INNOCENT III. ON PETER'S PENCE IN ENGLAND.

(1213.)

Nicolao Tusculano episcopo, apostolicæ Sedis legato, et Pandulpho subdiacono et familiari nostro.

Cum sicut vestra discretio plene novit, singulæ domus totius Angliæ singulos denarios pro censu beati Petri annuatim nobis solvere teneantur, prælati Angliæ qui eam nostro nomine collegerunt, rem invito Domino contrectantes, majorem sibi exinde partem non veriti sunt retinere, cum non nisi trecentas marcas nobis persolverint, et sibi mille vel amplius usurparint.

Ut igitur jus Ecclesiæ Romanæ servetur illæsum, discretioni vestræ præsentium auctoritate districte præcipiendo mandamus quatenus, prius recipientes ab eis denarium ipsum, prout hactenus exsolverunt, et eos ad id, si necesse fuerit, per censuram ecclesiasticam appellatione postposita compellentes, firmiter postmodum ex parte nostra injungatis eisdem, ut residuum cum integritate persolvant.

Non enim videmus quo jure valeant se tueri cum nec concessionem possint ostendere a sede apostolica sibi factam, nec centensionam contra Romanam Ecclesiam præscriptionem probare, maxime si tempora schismatum subducantur. . . .

Datum Laterani quinto kal. februarii, pontificatus nostri anno decimo sexto.—(*Rymer*, Vol. i., p. 182.)

No. 9.

LETTER OF POPE INNOCENT III. TO THE BISHOPS,
BARONS, AND PEOPLE OF IRELAND.

(1213.)

Innocentius episcopus, servus servorum Dei, venerabilibus fratribus archiepiscopis et episcopis, et dilectis filiis abbatibus, et cæteris ecclesiarum prælatis, et nobilibus viris, principibus, comitibus, baronibus, et universis militibus et populis per Hiberniam constitutis salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Cum, per ipsius gratiam, qui discordantes parietes in se lapide angulari copulavit, vera pax et plena concordia sit inter Regnum et Sacerdotium in Anglia reformata, nos, qui tenemur curam et sollicitudinem gerere specialem de carissimo in Christo filio nostro Johanne illustri Anglorum rege, ac ejus Regno quod ad Romanam Ecclesiam, per donum ipsius, speciali jure noscitur pertinere, sibi et hæredibus suis providere volentes, per apostolica vobis scripta mandamus atque præcipimus, quatenus in fidelitate ipsius regis ac hæredum suorum prompto animo et corde sincero perseverare curetis; tales vos, circa devotionem ipsius, per omnia exhibentes, quod tam a nobis quam ipso debeatis merito commendari; scientes pro certo quod nos ad ipsius commodum et honorem efficaciter aspiramus.

Datum Laterani 5 kal. novembr., pontificatus nostri anno sextodecimo.—(*Rymer*, Vol. i., p. 179.)

No. 10.

LETTER OF THE KING OF ENGLAND TO THE BISHOPS
OF IRELAND.

(1275.)

Rex venerabilibus patribus, archiepiscopis, et episcopis terræ Hiberniæ, salutem. Qualiter terra prædicta, per discordias et guerras, ibidem diu est habitas, depauperata existit fide perpenditis oculata; unde cum super hoc sumus, nec immerito, anxii animo et turbati, et totis desideriis affectemus quod hujusmodi controversiæ et guerræ pacificentur; nobis et fide et dilectione, quibus nobis tenemini, mandamus, rogantes quatenus, de consilio justitiarum nostri terræ prædictæ, et aliorum fidelium nostrorum partium illarum, taliter ad invicem provideatis, quod per divinum adjutorium et vestram circumspectam discretionem hujusmodi controversiæ et guerræ pacificentur et sedentur, etc. Teste rege apud Wodestok 12 die augusti.—(*Rymer*, Vol. ii., p. 56).

No. 11.

LETTER OF POPE JOHN XXII. TO KING EDWARD II.

(1317).

Joannes episcopus, servus servorum Dei, etc. Eduardo regi Angliæ illustri.

Paternum amorem ad tuæ celsitudinis incrementa, fili charissime, gerimus, dum ad ea, quæ justo placent iudici, tui regni terrarum et subditorum tuorum sint opportuna quieti, et famæ tuæ pariter et honori prospiciant, sollicitis hortationibus invitamus. Propter quod in eis persuasiones nostras devota debes mente suscipere, et ad executionem illarum te paratum et flexibilem exhibere.

Ecce, fili, quasdam recepimus litteras, directas pridem per Ibernicos magnates et populum dilectis filiis nostris Gaucelino tit. SS. Marcellini, et Petri presbytero et Luca S. Mariæ *in via lata* diacono, cardinalibus Apostolicæ Sedis Nuntiis, et per eos nobis suis interclusas litteris destinatas, in quarum serie vidimus inter cætera contineri, quod, cum felicitis recordationis Adrianus papa prædecessor noster, sub certis modo et forma distinctis apertius in Apostolicis litteris inde factis, claræ memoriæ Henrico regi Angliæ progenitori tuo, dominium Ibernix concessisset, ipse rex ac successores ipsius reges Angliæ usque ad hæc tempora, modum et formam hujusmodi non servantes, quinimo eos transgredientes, indebite, diris afflictionibus inauditis, importabilium servitutum oneribus, et tyrannidibus inhumanis, ipsos eo miserabilius et intolerabilius quo diutius oppresserunt, nec fuit hactenus qui revocaret illata gravamina, aut errata corrigeret: non fuit quem pia compassio super eorum contritione moveret, quamvis super his ad te recursus habitus fuerit, et clamor validus oppressorum aures tuas quandoque pulsaret: unde talia ferre nequeunt ulterius, coacti sunt se a domo tua subducere, et alium in suum regimen advocare. Hæc, dilectissime fili, si veritate nitantur, tanto nimirum infestiora nostris accedunt affectibus quanto desideramus intentius, ut tibi prospere cuncta cedant. Circa illa versari sedulo debes, eaque promptis affectibus exequi, quæ tuo sint placita Creatori, et ab omnibus abstinere sollicite per quæ contra te debeat provocari Deus ipse et Dominus ultionum, qui gemitus afflictorum injuste minime despicit, et qui propter injustitias peculiarem suum dejecisse describitur populum, et translationem fecisse regnorum. Quanto etiam desiderabilius, his præsertim impacatis temporibus, cupimus te illis libenter intendere, per quæ tuorum corda fidelium ad tuam benevolentiam et obedientiam debeant allici, et illa pro se vitare quibus valeant a tuæ cultu devotionis avelli.

Quia itaque, fili, tua non modicum interest hujus novæ mutationis vitare dispendium, quamplurimumque expedit ut hæc non negligantururbationis initia, ne illis periculose crescentibus, se o medicinæ remedia præparentur. Excellentiam regiam sollicitamus presentibus, sano nihilominus consilio suadentes, quatenus hæc prudenti meditatione considerans, et cum suo discreto consilio conferens, super illis circa præmissorum gravaminum correctionem et reformationem debitam et festinam viis et modis decetibus

si sufficienter provideri mandes et facias, sic discriminosis principiis in hac parte ob stare procures, quod et illi, per quem regnas, placere valeas, et te in eis efficaciter implente quod debes, cujusvis adversum te querelæ materia conquiescat. Per quod iidem Hibernici saniori ducti consilio, tibi ut Domino pareant, aut si (quod absit) in incepta rebellione manere voluerint, causam suam in apertam injustitiam, te apud Deum et homines excusato, convertant.

Ut autem de prædictis gravaminibus et querelis, quibus prædicti innituntur Ibernici, tuis sensibus innotescat ad plenum, præscriptas litteras missas cardinalibus antedictis, tum formam literarum, quas prædictus Adrianus prædecessor noster eidem Henrico regi Angliæ de terra Ibernix concessisse dicitur, tuæ magnitudini mittimus præsentibus interclusas.—(Dat. iii. Kal. Julii.)

No. 12.

LETTER OF KING EDWARD III. ON THE TROUBLES OF IRELAND.

(1353.)

Rex cancellario suo Hibernico, salutem, Quia guerræ fortes in terra Hiberniæ inter fideles nostros terræ illius et Hibernicos nobis rebellantes, a diu est, invalescunt; et, si prælati aut alii magnates dictæ terræ (per quorum consilium et juvamen eadem terra contra hujusmodi rebellantes regi debeat et defendi), a dicta terra Hiberniæ recesserint (ad quod se parant, ut accepimus), ipsa terra periculis gravibus (quod absit), verisimiliter subjaceret: nos hujusmodi periculis, quatenus poterimus, obviare volentes, vobis mandamus quod in terra prædicta, in locis ubi expedire videritis, publice proclamari et ex parte nostra faciatis firmiter inhiberi, ne quis, prælatus, vel religiosus, comes, baro, miles, vel alius homo ad arma, per quos terra prædicta contra hujusmodi pericula defendi poterit, sub pœna forisfacturæ omnium quæ nobis forisfacere poterit, extra terram illam transeat absque licentia nostra speciali, etc. Et omnes illos, quos, post proclamationem et inhibitionem prædictas, extra terram prædictam inveneritis transituros, una cum equis et harnesiis suis, arestari, et sub aresto deteneri faciatis, quousque a nobis inde aliud habueritis in mandatis. Teste rege apud Westmonasterium, vigesimo quarto die februarii.—(Rymer, Vol. v., p. 748).

No. 13.

CONVOCAION OF A GREAT STATE COUNCIL IN IRELAND.

(1361.)

Quia terra nostra Hiberniæ, per invalescentes a diu Hibernicorum inimicorum nostrorum incursus, propter impotentiam

fideliū nostrorū habitantiū in eadem, et pro eo quod magnates et alii de regno nostro Angliæ, terras in ea habentes, commodum dictarū terrarū suarū in eadem terra capiunt, et defensionem aliquā non faciunt, jam tantæ vastitatis et destructionis miseriæ subicitur, quod, nisi Deus avertat, et celerius succurratur eidem, ad totalem perditionem in proximo deducetur, etc. Volumus, vobiscum, et cum aliis de eodem regno, terras in dicta terra Hiberniæ habentibus, colloquium habere et tractatum, etc. Apud Westmonasterium in Quindena Paschæ proximo futura, etc.—(*Rymer*, Vol. p. vi., 318.)

No. 14.

COMMAND GIVEN TO THE BARONS BY EDWARD III. TO
SET OUT FOR IRELAND.

(1368.)

La terre est en point d'estre deiuz brief temps, parduz, si secours et remede ne y soient, par la grace de Dieu, plus hartivement mys ; etc. Et, en cas q'ils ne voillent cestes choses faire, nous prendrons en nostre main les Seignuries et terres avantdites, a donner as autres, qi illoeques vorront demurrer et en habiter, sur la defense et conquete d'y ceulx, etc. La parde et destruction de mesme la terre d'Irlande sont ore plus evidentment apparantz, que n'estoient unques devant ces heures.—(*Rymer*, Vol. vi., p. 594.)

No. 15.

BRIEF OF KING EDWARD VI., "HEAD OF THE CHURCH"
IN IRELAND.

(1547).

Cum regibus quidem omnibus christianam fidem professis a Deo Optimo Maximo omnis juris dicendi potestas collata sit, nobis tum, qui fidei defensoris peculiari quidem titulo utamur, maxime præ cæteris curæ esse debet, ut non solum orthodoxa fides inter nostros subditos integerrime colatur et observetur, verum etiam ut justitia unicuique ex æquo tribuatur . . . Nos qui Ecclesiæ tum Anglicanæ tum Hiberniæ jure supremi capitis præesse dignoscimur . . . vobis et vestrum duobus conjunctim plenam et absolutam potestatem, auctoritatem et facultatem, de tempore in tempus, nomine nostro dandi concedendi et elargiendi omnibus et singulis personis utriusque sexus in regno nostro Hiberniæ, et sub ditione nostra Hibernica degentibus, præsentibus et futuris . . . omnia quæcumque licentiarum dispensa-

tionum compositionum facultatum concessionum rescriptorum delegationum aliorumque scriptorum quorumque genera, pro quibusvis casibus et causis . . . prout archiepiscopus Cantuariensis in regno nostro Angliæ dat concedit et largitur, etc.—(*Rymer*, Vol. xv., p. 146.)

No. 16.

BRIEF OF KING EDWARD VI. AGAINST THE AUTHORITY OF THE POPE.

(1551.)



Cum per suggestionem et informationem apareat . . . quod episcopus Romanus auctoritatem nostram supream capitis ecclesiæ Anglicanæ et Hibernicæ falso et injuste usurpans et exercens, quædam ecclesiastica beneficia et emolumenta . . . ad cultum divinum in eadem augmentandum dedit concessit univit . . . ac auctoritate et jurisdictione Romani Pontificis sic, ut præmittitur, usurpata, demum per felicissimæ memoriæ dominum Henricum octavam nuper regem Angliæ patrem nostrum penitus abolita et adnullata . . . auctoritate nostra supremi capitis ecclesiæ Anglicanæ et Hibernicæ qua fungimur dictam ecclesiam sancti Nicolai de Galwey in collegium sive ecclesiam collegiatam transponimus et mutamus per præsentem . . . Et si secus a quoquam quavis auctoritate scienter vel ignoranter attemptari contigerit, illud irritum decernimus et inane . . . Teste rege apud Westmonasterium vicesimo nono die Aprilis—By Brief of the Private Seal.—(*Rymer*, Vol. xv., p. 258.)

No. 17.

CONSISTORIAL DECREE ON THE ERECTION OF IRELAND INTO A KINGDOM.

(1555.)

Romæ die VII mensis junii 1555, apud Sanctum-Marcum fuit consistorium, in quo referente reverendissimo Puteo, erexit insulam Hiberniæ, cujus ab eo tempore, quo illius dominium per sedem apostolicam adepti sunt reges Angliæ, qui pro tempore fuerint, se dominus tantum nuncupare consueverant, et cujus regium titulum quondam Henricus VIII, postquam ab unitate catholicæ Ecclesiæ et obedientia Romani Pontificis secessit, prætextu cujusdam legis per Parlamentum ejusdem insulæ, ut prætenditur, latæ, primo, et deinde ejus natus Eduardus VI, eorum nominum, qui dum viverent, pro regibus Angliæ se gesserunt, de facto usurpaverant, in regnum, ad instar aliarum insularum regio titulo, dignitate et honore ful-

gentium, sine præjudicio jurium sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ, et cujuscumque alterius in ea vel ad illam jus habere prætendentis, ac titulo, dignitate, honore, facultate, juribus, insignibus regiis, quibus alia Christifidelium regna utuntur, insignavit et decoravit.

No. 18.

BULL OF POPE PAUL IV. ERECTING IRELAND INTO A
KINGDOM.

(1555.)

Illius per quem reges regnant, et principes dominantur, vices licet immeriti gerentes in terris, votis catholicorum regum et principum quorum probata in Deum pietatis, et exiniæ erga Romanum Ecclesiam fidei constantia, ac sinceræ devotionis affectus in nostro, et Apostolicæ Sedis conspectu clarere dignoscuntur, libenter annuimus, eaque favoribus prosequimur opportunis. Hinc est, quod nos clarissimum in Christo filium nostrum Philippum regem, et charissimam in Christo filiam nostram Mariam reginam Angliæ et Franciæ illustres . . . (absolution) . . . insulam Hiberniæ, cujus ab eo tempore, quo illius dominium per eadem prædictam adepti sunt reges Angliæ, qui pro tempore fuerint, se dominos tantum nuncupari consueverunt et cujus regium titulum quondam Henricus Octavus, postquam ab unitate Ecclesiæ catholicæ et obedientia Romani Pontificis secessit, prætextu cujusdam legis per Parlamentum ejusdem insule ut prætenditur latæ, primo, et deinde ejus natus Eduardus Sextus, eorum nominum, qui dum viverent, pro regibus Angliæ se gesserunt, de facto usurparunt; in regnum ad instar aliarum insularum regiis titulo, dignitate, et honore fulgentium, sine præjudicio jurium ipsius Romanæ Ecclesiæ et cujuscumque alterius in illa, vel ad illam jus habere prætendentis: ad omnipotentis Dei laudem et gloriam, ac gloriosissimæ ejus Genitricis Virginis Mariæ, totiusque curiæ cœlestis honorem, et fidei catholicæ exaltationem, præfatis Philippo rege et Maria regina nobis super hoc humiliter supplicantibus, de fratrum nostrorum consilio, et apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine, apostolica auctoritate perpetuo erigimus, ac titulo, dignitate, honore, facultatibus, juribus, insigniis, prærogativis, antelationibus, et præeminentiis regiis, ac quibus alia Christifidelium regna utuntur, potiuntur, et gaudent, ac uti, potiri, et gaudere poterunt quomodolibet in futurum, insignimus, et decoramus. Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Marcum, anno Incarnationis Dominicæ 1555, septimo Idus juniis, pontificatus nostri anno primo.

No. 19.

CONFERENCE OF POPE PAUL IV. WITH THE AMBAS-
SADORS OF QUEEN MARY.

(1555.)

In secretiori postea cum legatis sermone Pontifex indoluit nondum restituta Ecclesiæ suæ bona, quæ ab alio occupari omnino intolerandum esse dixit, ideoque ad minimum usque quadrantem ab injustis usurpatoribus vindicanda, etc. Tum, unum hoc Anglis persuasum cupit, earum rerum possessionem illicitam, esse anathema et contagium, cui vindicandæ regnum Angliæ sit pro comite individuo perpetuam miseriam ac infelicitatem habiturum. Iisdem legatis insuper mandavit, ut ea de re continuo ad principes suos rescriberent, neque semel id monuisse contentus, id ipsum omnibus occasionibus iterabat. Disertim etiam præcepit, ut primo quoque tempore exactionem denariorum S. Petri in usum revocari curarent, quod de more exactorem eo mittere decrevit: quod quidem munus ipse in Angliam missus totos tres annos obierit maxima cum voluptate, cum tantam non in populo tantum, sed in tenuioribus e plebe ad pendendum promptitudinem cerneret. Neque unquam sperandum ipsis apertum iri a Beato Petro cœli portam, quamdiu quæ in terris ipsius propria sunt, cum summa ejus Divi injuria usurparent. — (*Bzovius*, anno 1555.)

No. 20.

BRIEF OF GREGORY XIII. ON THE IRISH INSURRECTION.

(1580.)

Gregorius XIII, universis et singulis archiepiscopis, episcopis, prælatis, nec non principibus, comitibus, baronibus, ac populis regni Hiberniæ, salutem et Apostolicam benedictionem.

Cum proximis superioribus annis, per nostras litteras vos exhortati fuerimus, ut ad vestram libertatem recuperandam, eamque adversus hæreticos tuendam et conservandam, bonæ memoriæ Jacobo Giraldino, qui dirum servitutis jugum vobis ab Anglis sanctæ Romanæ Ecclesiæ desertoribus impositum depellere, summo animi ardore cogitabat, pro virili vestro omnes præsto adesse, eumque contra Dei et vestros hostes ire parantem, prompte ac strenue adjuvare velletis, et quo id alacrius efficeretis, omnibus contritis et confessis, qui ipsum Jacobum Ducem ejusque exercitum catholicæ fidei assertorem et propugnatorem secuti fuissent, et se illi adjunxissent, aut consilio, favore, comeatibus, armis, aliisque bellicis rebus seu quacumque ratione et in hac expeditione opem dedissent, plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum veniam et remissionem, et eandem quæ proficiscentibus ad bellum contra Turcas, et ad recuperationem Terræ Sanctæ per Romanos Pontifices impertiri solita est, concessimus. Nuper autem non sine gravi

animi nostri dolore per nos accepto, ipsum Jacobum fortiter cum hostibus dimicando (sicut Domino placuit), occubuisse, dilectum vero filium Joannem Giraldinum ejus consobrinum in expeditione hujusmodi eximia pietate et animi magnitudine, auctore Deo, cujus causa agitur, successisse compluraque egregia facinora de catholica fide merendo jam edidisse. Idcirco vos omnes et singulos, majori quo possumus affectu, hortamur, requirimus, et urgemus in Domino, ut eundem Joannem Ducem, ejusque exercitum, omni ope, quem admodum dictum Jacobum viventem, ut faceretis vos admonuimus, contra dictos hæreticos adjuvare studeatis: nos enim vobis omnibus confessis et communicatis, et vestris singulis in dictis litteris contenta pro ipso Joanne et ejus exercitu facientibus; et post ipsius obitum, si forte contigerit (quod Deus avertere dignetur) Jacobi ejus fratri adhærentibus et faventibus, eandem plenariam omnium peccatorum vestrorum indulgentiam et remissionem, quam adversus Turcas, et pro recuperanda Terra Sancta consequuntur bellantes, de omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus auctoritate confisi, tribuimus et elargimur præsentibus, quoad dicti Joannes et Jacobus fratres vixerint, et bellum contra hæreticos ipsos gesserint, duraturis. Quoniam autem difficile esset has nostras litteras ad omnium quorum interest notitiam pervenire, volumus ut earum exemplis etiam impressis, manu notarii publici subscriptis, sigilloque personæ in dignitate ecclesiastica constitutæ obsignatis, plena et certa fides ubique habeatur, ac si præsentibus exhibitis, vel ostensæ. Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die 13 Maii 1580, pontificatus nostri anno octavo.

No. 21.

BRIEF OF CLEMENT VIII.

(1600.)

Clemens papa VIII, universis et singulis venerabilibus fratribus archiepiscopis, episcopis et prælatis; necnon dilectis filiis principibus, comitibus, baronibus, populis regni Hiberniæ, salutem et apostolicam benedictionem.

Cum jamdiu sicut accipimus, vos Romanorum Pontificum prædecessorum nostrorum, ac nostris et Apostolicæ Sedis cohortationibus adducti, ad vestram libertatem recuperandam eamque adversus hæreticos tuendam et conservandam, bonæ memoriæ Jacobo Giraldino (qui durum servitutis jugum vobis ab Anglis Sanctæ Ecclesiæ desertoribus impositum, summo animi ardore depellere dum vixit pro viribus procuravit), deinde Joanni Giraldino ejusdem Jacobi consobrino, et novissime dilecto filio nobili viro Hugoni principi O'Neillo dicto comiti Tironensi, baroni Dungennaniæ, et capitaneo generali exercitus Catholici in Hibernia, conjunctis animis ac viribus præsto fueritis, ac opem et auxilium præstiteritis, ipsique duces et eorum milites manu Domini exercituum illis assistente processu

temporis plurima egregia facinora contra hostes viriliter pugnando præstiterint, et in posterum præstare parati sint, nos, ut vos ac Dux et milites prædicti alacrius in expeditionem hanc contra dictos hæreticos opem et operam in posterum etiam præstare studeatis, spiritualibus gratiis et favoribus prosequi volentes, eorumdem prædecessorum nostrorum exemplo adducti; ac de omnipotentis Dei misericordia ac beatorum Petri et Pauli apostolorum ejus autoritate confisi, vobis omnibus et singulis qui prædictum Hugonem Tironensem ducem ejusque exercitum catholicæ fidei assertores et propugnatores sequimini, ac illis vos adjunxeritis; aut auxilio, favore, comeatibus, armis, aliisque bellicis rebus seu quacumque ratione eis in hac expeditione operam dederitis, ipsique Hugoni duci ejusque exercitus militibus universis et singulis, si vere pœnitentes et confessi, ac etiam, si fieri potuerit, sacra communione refecti fuerint; plenariam omnium peccatorum suorum veniam et remissionem, ac eandem quæ proficiscentibus ad bellum contra Turcas, ad recuperationem Terræ Sanctæ, per Romanos Pontifices concedi solita et misericorditer in Domino concedimus. Non obstantibus, etc.

Datum Romæ apud Sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die 16 Aprilis 1600, pontificatus nostri anno nono.

No. 22,

IRISH NATIONAL ASSOCIATION.

(1601.)

Clemens VIII dilecto filio nobili viro principi Nelio, exercitus catholici in Hibernia duci et capitaneo generali.

Cognovimus ex litteris nobilitatis tuæ et ex his quæ dilectus filius Petrus Lombardus civis vester præpositus cameracensis nobis coram exposuit, sacrum fœdus quod tu et quamplures principes et procures et nobiles primarii regni istius, Dei benignitate, iniistis, charitatis glutino colligatum conservari et augeri; quodque ejusdem Domini exercituum ope et virtute, prospere a vobis pluries pugnatum est adversus Anglos Ecclesiæ et fidei desertores. Magnam ex his voluptatem in Domino cepimus, ipsique Patri misericordiarum Deo gratias egimus, qui adhuc in regno isto reliquit sibi multa millia virorum qui non curvaverint genua sua ante Baal. Hi enim impias hæreses et prophanas novitates non sunt secuti, imo eas detestati, fortiter pugnant pro hæreditate majorum suorum, pro fidei salute, integritate et unitate cum Ecclesia retinenda, quæ una est Catholica et Apostolica, extra quam non est salus. Laudamus egregiam pietatem et fortitudinem tuam, fili, et principum et cæterorum omnium qui tecum juncti ac fæderati, nulla pro Dei gloria pericula recusant, seque majoribus suis qui bellicæ virtutis et catholicæ religionis studio ac laude imprimis floruerunt, dignos nepotes et justos successores ostendunt, et palam profitentur. Conservate, filii, hanc mentem, conservate unionem et consensionem vestram.

et Deus omnipotens, Deus pacis et concordiae erit vobiscum, et pugnabit pro vobis, et quemadmodum fecit, prosternet inimicos suos ante faciem vestram. Nos autem qui nobilitatem tuam et vos omnes avitae fidei et gloriae imitatores paterne amamus, et gerimus in visceribus Jesu Christi, non cessamus Deum orare nostrum pro vestra salute et felicitate; vestrique solliciti sumus et erimus semper, quantum cum Deo poterimus; atque, ubi opus fuerit, scribemus efficaciter ad reges et principes Catholicos filios nostros, ut vobis et causae vestrae omni ope suffragentur. Cogitamus etiam propediem mittere ad vos peculiarem nuntium nostrum, et hujus Sanctae Sedis, in qua Deo authore meritis licet imparibus praesidemus, virum pium, prudentem, zelo Dei praeditum, et nobis probatum, qui nostri erga vos honoris testis sit; vobisque omnibus in rebus ubi usus venerit, adjumento sit ad salutarem et necessariam unionem vestram conservandum, ac Catholicam fidem propugnandam, ac omnia denique pro sui muneris officio efficienda quibus Dei honor et cultus in regno isto augeatur. Interea placuit has nostras litteras ad vos praemittere testes amoris nostri; et ut vos omnes tanquam filios nostros consolamur. Ipsum vero Petrum Lombardum, quem nobilitas tua oratorem et negotiorum gestorem apud nos destinavit, et jam libenter audivimus et deinceps audiemus. Tibi vero et caeteris qui tibi unanimes pro fidei catholicae propugnatione adherent, nostram et apostolicam benedictionem benigne impertimur, Deumque precamur ut angelos emittat in circuitu vestro, et pios conatus vestros sua celesti gratia dirigat vosque dextera suae potentiae perpetuo tueatur.

Datum Romae apud Sanctum Petrum sub annulo Piscatoris die 20 januarii anno 1601, pontificatus nostri anno nono. Silvius Antonianus, Cardinalis.

No. 23.

DECISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF SALAMANCA
REGARDING THE IRISH WAR.

(1603.)

Censura doctorum universitatis Salmanticae et Vallisoleti, de praesenti Hiberniae bello, et eorumdem declaratio litterarum sanctissimi domini nostri Clementis papae VIII super eodem bello.

Illustrissimus princeps Hugo O'Nellus bellum gerit cum Angliae regina et Anglis ob Catholicam religionem tuendam, ut scilicet liceat illi et Ibernis libere catholicam religionem profiteri, quam libertatem vi et armis Angliae regina conatur eripere. Duo nunc circa hoc bellum in dubium revocantur. Alterum est an liceat catholicis Hibernis praedicto principi Hugoni in eo bello favere armis et quibuscumque aliis modis? Alterum an eisdem catholicis liceat pugnare contra praefatum principem citra mortale peccatum, et Anglis in eo bello favere armis et quavis alia ratione?

Præsertim, cum si Anglis hoc auxilii genus negent, manifesto vitae periculo aut amittendi bona temporalia sese exponant. Et

præterea cum ipsis catholicis Hiberniæ a summo pontifice sit permissum ut possint prædicta reginæ Angliæ obedire, ac ut legitimam reginam tributa illi solvendo recognoscere, videntur id præstare posse quod subditorum est, pugnare scilicet adversus reginæ rebelles, qui debitam ei obedientiam negant, et terram illius ditioni subjectam usurpare videntur.

Ut utrique questioni satisfiat, tamquam certum est accipien dum, posse Romanum Pontificem fidei desertores et eos qui catholicam religionem oppugnant, armis compellere ac coercere, cum alia ratio non suppetet tanto malo occurrendi. Et præterea ut primum constituendum, Angliæ reginam catholicam religionem oppugnare, nec permittere. Iberos catholicam fidem publice colere; eademque de causa prædictum principem et ante eum alios quos apostolicæ litteræ Clementis VIII. commemorant, bellum adversus illam suscepisse.

His ita constitutis, facile prima questio expeditur.

Citra questionem namque est posse quoscunque catholicos dicto principi in prædicto bello favere, idque maximo cum merito, et spe retributionis æternæ.

Cum enim prædictus princeps bellum gerat autoritate summi Pontificis ob tuendam religionem catholicam, ad idque eum Pontifex per suas litteras adhortetur et omnes Christifideles, ut ex ejus litteris constat, atque principi in eo bello faventes multis gratis prosequatur, ac si bellum contra Turcas gererent; nemo jure dubitaverit et susceptum bellum justum esse, et magni esse meriti pro catholica religione, quæ omnium maximum bonorum est, tuenda pugnare.

Est etiam de secunda quæstione omnino certum, eos omnes catholicos peccare mortaliter qui Anglorum castra contra prædictum principem sequuntur, nec posse illos æternam salutem consequi, nec ab ullo sacerdote a suis peccatis absolvi, nisi prius resipiscant, ac castra Anglorum deserant.

Idemque de illis censendum est, qui armis et comeatibus in eo bello Anglis favent, vel quid simile tribuunt, præter ea tributa consueta quæ ex summi Pontificis indulgentia et permissione eis licet reginæ Angliæ aut ejus exactoribus solvere.

Haec assertio hac apertissima ratione confirmatur, quoniam per litteras Summi Pontificis satis est compertum, Angliæ reginam et ejus duces bellum gerere injustum contra prædictum principem et eos qui illi favent. Cum enim Pontifex dicat Anglos adversus Catholicam religionem pugnare, eosque non minus ac Turcas oppugnare debere, eisdem gratis eos oppugnantem prosequatur quibus contra Turcas pugnantem prosequitur, quis dubitet bellum ab Anglis adversus catholicum exercitum omnino iniquum geri? At nemini licet iniquo bello favere, aut illi adesse sub pœna æternæ damnationis.

Peccant ergo gravissime catholici qui in castris hæreticorum contra prædictum principem pugnant in bello aperte iniquo et injusto, et omnes qui eidem bello favent armis aut comeatibus aut quacunque alia ratione quæ per se belli progressum juvent, nec possent rationem inire indifferentis obsequii.

Nec eos quicquam juvat apostolicas litteras subreptionis notare: surreptio enim intervenire non potest, ubi nulla narratur petitio

eorum in quorum favorem expeditur. At summus Pontifex aperte in illis docet se et prædecessores suos sponte exhortatos fuisse ad illud bellum gerendum Iberos principes ac fideles omnes; et ad eos magis provocandos magnis eos gratiis ac indulgentiis donat. Qui ergo fieri potest, ut surreptitiæ sint litteræ quæ solum exhortationem magnis gratiis erga assentientes cumulatam continent?

Nec possunt catholici Anglis faventes rationibus in secunda quæstione adductis se tueri. Nullum enim peccatum mortale committendum est, etiamsi vita aut res familiaris amittenda sit. Ea vero quæ bellum injustum per se promovent ac juvant exercere, aperte peccatum est mortale. Permissum est etiam Catholicis hæreticæ reginæ id genus obsequii præstare quod catholicam religionem non oppugnat. Nec fuit nec potest esse Pontificis mens ea obsequia circa reginam permittere quæ aperte cum fine et scopo ipsius Pontificis de promovenda in Hibernia catholica fide ac religione pugnant. Hanc etiam ejus esse mentem et scopum litteræ ipsæ apertissime declarant.

Ex quibus omnibus satis manifestum relinquitur, illustrissimum principem Hugonem O'Nellum et alios Catholicos Hiberniæ bellum gerentes adversus reginam hæreticam orthodoxam fidem oppugnantem, nullo modo rebelles esse neque debitam obedientiam negare, aut terras reginæ injuste usurpare, quin potius illos justissimo bello se terramque suam ab iniqua et impia tyrannide vindicare, sacramque orthodoxam fidem, ut christianos ac catholicos decet, pro viribus tueri, atque defendere. Quæ omnia et singula nos infrascripti ut certissima ac verissima judicamus et approbamus.

Datum Salmanticæ secundo februarii anno Domini millesimo sexcentesimo tertio.

No. 24.

STRANGE STORY TOLD BY BZOVIVS.

Circa annum enim Incarnationis Dominicæ centesimum et sexagesimum supra millesimum, cum Petri cathedram teneret Hadrianus quartus natione Anglus, qui sanctitate ac prædicatione sua Norwegiæ Sueciæque regna ante pontificatum ad fidem Christi, converterat, Hiberni, qui initio statim post christianam religionem acceptam, se suaque omnia in Pontificis Romani ditionem dediderant, nec quemquam alium supremum Hiberniæ principem ad illud usque tempus præter unum Romanum Pontificem agnoverant, cum jam intestinis multorum regulorum ac tyrannorum bellis vehementer affligerentur, et eorum nonnulli magnæque pars populi, pacis potiundæ causa, et ne aliis subessent, Henrico secundo Anglorum regi (sub quo Divus Thomas Cantuariensis postea martyrium passus est, et qui tunc Hiberniam magno cum exercitu ingressus fuerat) parere cuperent; utriusque partis nomine, id est tam regis quam suorum principum et episcoporum ab Hadriano pontifice supplices petierunt, ut ad tollendas controversias ac seditiones, quas ipsi iere perpetuas ex regulorum multitudine habebant, ad

constituendum etiam christianæ religionis meliorem cultum, præcipue in matrimoniis contrahendis ac colendis, qui bellorum consuetudine valde fuerat depravatus, dignaretur sua Sanctitas Henrico Regi, qui nonnulla jam insulæ loca, sui ac suorum, hoc est Roberti Fitz-Stephani et Richardi Zepœnsis comitis armis acquisita tenebat, totius Hiberniæ dominium concedere; quod Pontifex cum his aliisque de causis, tum etiam quia nihil inde emolumenti accipiebat, nec sine magnis ipsis umptibus tam remoto regno succurrere poterat, haud gravate concessit, certis tamen conditionibus adjunctis, quibus tam ipse Henricus, quam omnes ejus posterī, regnum illud tenerent, et sibi ab Apostolica Sede donatum agnoscerent; quas condiciones cum Henricus Hibernique principes et populus, binis in comitiis, primo Dublini, deinde Casselli celebratis, jurato approbassent, rex Angliæ Hiberniæ Dominus auctoritate apostolica declaratus fuit.--(Bzovius, 1542, No. 12; Vol. xx., p. 84.)

INDEX.

	PAGE		PAGE
ADRIAN IV. :—		Apocryphal Documents,	
Asked to approve of an		Fate of	161 seq.
Invasion of Ireland	4	Avranches, Cathedral of :—	
Objects to it	5	Cardinals Gratian and	
His Letter to King Louis		Vivian hold an inves-	
VII. of France	6 seq.	tigation there	23 seq.
This Letter relates to Ire-		Oath taken by Henry II.	30, 59
land (<i>Hibernia</i>)	10 seq.		
It does not relate to		BARONIUS, CARDINAL :—	
Spain (<i>Hispania</i>)	13 seq.	Gives the oath of Henry	
True Bull of	53 seq.	at Avranches	30
Biography of	142	Sources from which he	
Adventurers :—		draws	140
Were mere Brigands	85 seq.	Has little faith in	
What M'Geoghegan says		Adrian's Bull	142
of them	158	Becket, Thomas. (<i>See</i> St.	
Alexander III. :—		Thomas of Canterbury)	
Excommunicates all con-		Benedict Joseph Labre, St.	
cerned in the murder		A life of great poverty	
of St. Thomas of Can-		and sanctity	138 n
terbury	23	Benedict of Peterborough,	
"Charters" said to have		speaks of Strongbow	22
been sent to him	29	Bishops of Ireland :—	
Three letters attributed		Did they submit to	
to him	32	Henry II. ?	27 seq.
Another letter, which		No mention of them in	
Giraldus disclaims	64	Adrian's Bull	62
What Voltaine says of him	35	What they say of Uni-	
Migne's collection of		versity Education	86 n
his letters	64	Bishops of Scotland, Papal	
What M'Geoghegan says		Letter to them	17
of him	156	Bongars, James, first to in-	
Other doubts regard-		terpret that <i>H.</i> in	
ing the Bulls	148 n	Adrian's Letter stands	
Anchin, Annalist of :—		for Hispania	146
Is the author of <i>Continu-</i>		<i>Brendaniana</i> , by the Rev.	
atio <i>Acquicinetina</i>	19	D. O'Donoghue, P.P.	157 n
Speaks of Henry II.	19, 34	Brewer, Mr., Remarks on	
Anjou, Princes of, receive		Giraldus	72
Bulls of Investiture	84	Briefs, on the Irish War of	
Antoninus, Saint :—		Independence	128 seq.
Wrote a long chapter on		Brompton speaks of an	
Adrian IV.	137	Embassy to Adrian IV.	17
Cites the <i>Polycraticus</i>	137		

	PAGE		PAGE
<i>Bullarium Romanum</i> , a		Critics, who have ex-	
work not authenticated	33 n	amined the alleged	
Bulls and Briefs, some dif-		Bulls . . .	136 seq.
ferences between them	33 n	Cromwell, an inhuman	
Bzovius :—		monster . . .	127 n
His works . . .	143		
Strange story told by			
him . . .	144		
CAMBRENSIS. (See Giraldus		D'ARAGON, CARDINAL, writes	
Cambrensis.)		a life of Pope Adrian IV. . .	103
Camden, what MSS. he		Davis, Sir John, his advice	
followed . . .	70	for clearing Ulster . . .	159 n
Canon Law, diploma to be		De Lacy, Hugh, his con-	
interpreted according to		quests and death . . .	40 seq.
the rules of . . .	115 seq.	<i>Derriana</i> , by the Most	
Charlemagne, gave politi-		Rev. Dr. O'Doherty,	
cal sovereignty to		Bishop of Derry . . .	158 n.
Popes . . .	56 seq.	Desmond, Earl of, lands	
Charles I., his persecution		confiscated . . .	122 seq.
more intense . . .	125 seq.	Dimock, Rev. Mr., Re-	
Charles II., confirms pre-		marks on Giraldus . . .	73
vious confiscations . . .	128	Discovery of Pope Adrian's	
Christina, Queen of Sweden,		true letter, on the sub-	
buys the MSS. of Presi-		ject of an Irish Inva-	
dent Petau for their		sion . . .	10 seq.
weight in gold, and		Documents, by way of an	
presents them to the Vati-		Appendix . . .	164
can Library . . .	146	Downpatrick, the burial	
Clement III. :—		place of Saints Patrick,	
Extent of jurisdiction		Brigid, and Columbkille . . .	39
given to his Legate . . .	91	Dublin, attacked by Strong-	
Speaks of John Lack-		bow . . .	21
land as Earl of Morton,		Duchesne, Andrew, author	
not as Lord of Ireland . . .	116	of <i>Rerum Francicarum</i>	
Clement VIII., Briefs of		<i>Scriptores</i> . . .	145
128 seq.		Du Mont, Robert :—	
Confiscation of lands, in		Expresses surprise at	
Ireland . . .	120 seq.	the reconciliation be-	
Conrad, King of the		tween Louis VII. and	
Romans, his crusade a		Henry II. . .	2
failure . . .	8	Remarks on Strongbow . . .	22
Constantine :—			
Is falsely said to have		EDWARD I. exempts him-	
made a donation of		self from the usual oath	
islands to the Pope . . .	33	of fealty . . .	84
Extent of his power . . .	55	Edward II. :—	
Gave domains, &c., to		Also exempts himself	
Popes, but not politi-		from oath . . .	84
cal sovereignty . . .	56	Asks Irish Kings to send	
Corsica, a donation of		him men for his army . . .	90
Pepin and Charlemagne,		Receives a sharp letter	
not of Constantine, to		from Pope John	
the Popes . . .	57	XXII. . .	93 seq.

	PAGE		PAGE
Edward III. :—		Ginnell, Mr. Laurence, his	
Asks Irish Bishops to		learned essay, entitled	
send him able men		"Doubtful Grant of	
for his wars	104	Ireland," first published	
Forbids any office to be		in the <i>New Ireland</i>	
given to the Old		<i>Review</i>	100 n.
Irish	106 seq.	Giraldus Cambrensis :—	
Edward VI. :—		His credulity	28
Believes himself to be		First historian to men-	
Head of the Church in		tion Bull of Adrian	
Ireland, and acts ac-		IV.	41, 67
cordingly	111 seq.	Sketch of his life and	
Takes the pompous title		works	67 seq.
of King of England,		Several important facts	
France, and Ireland.	113	deduced from his	
Elizabeth, Queen of Eng-		remarks	72
land, her new plans of		How far his authority	
Confiscation	121 seq.	may be relied on	72 seq.
Emancipation of the		Gratian, his works not	
Irish	131 seq.	authenticated	58
Emigration, not necessary		Gregory VII., understands	
when people can prosper		the strategic position of	
at home	88 n.	Corsaica	58
FINLAY, S.J., REV. P.,		Gregory XIII., encourages	
urges the need of proper		the Irish to take up	
Catholic association	136 n.	arms	128 seq.
Freeman, Mr. Edward, Re-		Guidonis or Di Guido, O.P.,	
marks on Giraldus	74	Bernard, writes a Life of	
		Pope Adrian IV.	102
GALLIA CHRISTIANA, gives		H, in Pope Adrian IV.'s	
biography of Rotrodus	17	true letter, stands for	
Garibaldi, his expedition		Hibernia	10 seq.
from Marsala like that of		Hearne, Thomas, publishes	
the Welsh to Ireland	20	at Oxford the "Black	
Geraldine, James, suc-		Book of the Exchequer"	
ceeded by Hugh O'Neill		32, 148 n.
as leader of the Irish in		Henry I., his designs on	
arms	129	Ireland	1
Gerard, S.J., Rev. John,		Henry II. :—	
makes many interesting		Sets forth the interests	
remarks on English plots		of religion as motives	
.	159 n.	for an Invasion of	
Gervase :—		Ireland	1
His account of the flight		Gains Louis VII., King	
of Henry II. from		of France, to his views	
Normandy	23 seq.	Application to Pope	
Is quoted by Baronius	140	Adrian IV.	3 seq.
Gibbon, Edward, the his-		The Pope will not coun-	
torian, is mistaken	56 seq.	tenance the Invasion,	
		if the Irish people and	
		clergy do not desire it	4 seq.

	PAGE		PAGE
How Henry receives the Pope's decision . . .	15 seq.	Home and Foreign Industries . . .	85 n. seq., 141 n.
Hears of the murder of St. Thomas . . .	19, 23, 27	Hoveden. (<i>See</i> Roger de Hoveden.)	
Flight from Normandy . . .	19	INITIALS, often used in the Roman Chancery as substitutes for proper names	10 seq.
Takes refuge in Ireland . . .	24 seq.	Innocent III. :—	
Returns to Normandy . . .	26	Claimed Peter's Pence from England, but not from Ireland . . .	77
His oath in the Cathedral of Avranches . . .	30 seq.	Not so innocent as to accept a donation of Ireland from King John . . .	113
His eldest son wages war against him . . .	31	Ireland :—	
His power in Ireland only nominal . . .	35 seq.	State in the thirteenth century . . .	85 seq.
He plucks out the eyes of male hostages, and cuts off the ears and noses of female ones, among the Welsh . . .	36	Its invasion had not the conditions of a true conquest . . .	90 seq.
Was he incapable of forging a Bull ? . . .	51 seq.	Erected into a kingdom by Paul IV. . .	113 seq.
His falsehoods . . .	51 seq.	<i>Irish Ecclesiastical Record</i> , Dr. Moran's Article . . .	161
His designs on Scotland as well as on Ireland . . .	59 seq.	Irish Language, its revival a most worthy object for every Irish patriot . . .	133 n. seq.
Object of penetrating into Ireland . . .	62	Irish Saints, numerous on the Continent . . .	157 seq.
Never engaged in a single battle with the Irish . . .	90	Isidore Mercator, his false decretals last for seven hundred years . . .	161 seq.
His immoralities . . .	156 seq.	Isle of Man :—	
Henry III. :—		Designs of Henry II. . .	60
Entrusts the guardianship of his Irish dominions along the Irish coast to the King of Man . . .	83	King of Man offers his island to the Pope . . .	83
Takes the oath of fealty to the Holy See . . .	84	JAMES I. :—	
Henry IV. allows subsidies for the suppression of rebels and enemies . . .	108	First English King to hold sway in all Ireland . . .	90
Henry V. gives power to the Earl of March to grant amnesty to English and Irish rebels . . .	108	Commands all priests to leave Ireland . . .	124
Henry VII. :—		A merciless confiscator . . .	125
Bears witness to the frequency of revolts in Ireland . . .	108	John (Lackland), King of England :—	
Sends Poynning as lieutenant . . .	108 seq.	Has Cambrensis for a tutor . . .	68
Henry VIII., his innovations . . .	109 seq.		

- | | PAGE | | PAGE |
|--|-------------|---|----------|
| Places his person and kingdom under the sovereignty of the Pope | 78 seq. | Lingard, Dr. :— | |
| Lays a snare for the Pope | 93 | Speaks of Henry's flight to Ireland | 26, 35 |
| Made "Lord of Ireland" by his father, Henry II. | 116 | Has little faith in Adrian's Bull | 158 seq. |
| But called "Earl of Morton" by the Popes. | 116 | Logue, Cardinal, his views on Catholic association | 137 |
| John of Salisbury :— | | Lombard, Most Rev. Peter, led into an error | 99, 130 |
| Sketch of his life | 16 | Lords Commissioners of the Treasury, bring out a new edition of <i>Giraldus Cambrensis</i> , 8 vols., at the expense of the State | 74 n. |
| Was he charged to make known the false Bull? | 41 seq. | Lough, M.P., Mr. Thomas, his valuable book, <i>England's Wealth and Ireland's Poverty</i> | 132 n. |
| His <i>Polycraticus</i> | 41, 47, 48 | Louis VII., King of France :— | |
| His <i>Metalogicus</i> | 41, 45 seq. | Selected by Henry II. as an ally | 1 seq. |
| Did he write chapter xlii. of the <i>Metalogicus</i> ? | 41 | Agrees to invade Ireland | 4 |
| John Bayle's opinion of him | 43 | No mention of the apocryphal bull during his lifetime | 40 seq. |
| Date of his death | 43 | True letter of the Pope to him | 63 seq. |
| Just the man whose works would be chosen by a forger | 44 n. | Luard publishes, in 1874, the <i>Chronica Majora</i> of Matthew Paris | 75 |
| His chats and other familiarities with Pope Adrian at Beneventum | 18, 45 seq. | Lynch, Dr. John, his works | 147 seq. |
| Said to have obtained a grant of Ireland for Henry II. | 45 seq. | MAGINN, MOST REV. DR., his patriotic words | 131 n. |
| His letters | 51 n. | Mary, Queen of England : Succeeds to the throne | 113 seq. |
| What M'Geoghegan says | 155 | Makes restitution to the Church | 120 |
| John XXII. :— | | Matthew Paris :— | |
| Various Acts | 93 seq. | The chief historian in spreading a knowledge of the apocryphal bull | 75 |
| Letter to Edward II. | 96 seq. | Stumbles at every step | 75 |
| KILKENNY :— | | Draws the long bow | 75 seq. |
| Statutes of | 106 | M'Geoghegan, Abbé, author of <i>Histoire d'Irlande</i> :— | |
| Confederation of | 126 seq. | Is led into an error | 99 |
| LAND OF IRELAND, a common name of Ireland | 11 seq. | His remarks on the Bulls | 153 seq. |
| Lanigan, Dr. :— | | <i>Metalogicus</i> . (See John of Salisbury.) | |
| Believes in the genuineness of Adrian's Bull | 65 | | |
| Complains that the Irish are accused of barbarous manners | 65 | | |
| Lecky, Mr. W. E. H., remarks on the treatment of the Old Irish | 125 n. seq. | | |

	PAGE		PAGE
Migne's Collection :—		Did not believe the Pope	
Of Salisbury's Letters .	51 n.	to be Sovereign Lord	
Of Pope Adrian IV.'s		of Ireland .	117
letters .	63 n.	O'Neill, Donald :—	
Of Pope Alexander III.'s		Appeals to Pope John	
letters .	64 n.	XXII, .	96 seq.
Molloy, Mgr., on the elec-		His Memorial supposed	
trical power stored up in		to be the work of	
Irish bogs .	89 n.	Ulster Scotch	100 n.
Moran, Cardinal. Remarks		O'Neill, Hugh, wages war	
on his article in the <i>Irish</i>		against Elizabeth for	
<i>Ecclesiastical Record</i> 139, 161		many years .	129 seq.
Morris, Rev. W. B. ex-		O'Neill, Shane, feared by	
amines John of Salis-		the English .	121
bury's letters .	51 n.	O'Neill, Owen Roe, a	
Muratori gives Henry II.'s		noble-minded general .	147 n.
oath .	30	O'Sullivan, Don Philip, his	
		remarks on a certain	
NORMANS, men for whom		doctrine .	130 n.
nothing was sacred .	158	O'Toole, St. Laurence, a	
Normans of Italy more		"persistent opposer of	
faithful to the Church .	84	English rule in Ireland "	37 n.
Normans in Naples and		Over-taxation of Ireland :—	
Sicily, submit to com-		Enormous .	86 n.
mon law of investiture	50, 84	Remarks of Mr. Thos.	
		Lough, M.P. .	132 n.
OATH, which Henry II.		Remarks of Mr. John	
swore in the Cathedral		Redmond, M.P. .	132 n.
of Avranches .	30 seq.		
O'Callaghan, Mr. John C.:—		PAGI, ANTONY, author of	
His remarks on a dona-		notes on the Annals of	
tion of Constantine	58 seq.	Baronius .	152
Edits the work <i>Macariae</i>		Pagi, Francis, too often	
<i>Excidium</i> .	150 seq.	copies from his uncle	
O'Connell, Daniel, the		Antony .	153
Irish Liberator .	133 n.	Pale :—	
O'Growney, Rev. Eugene,		Full of petty tyrants	37 seq.
his Life sketched by Miss		In a state of anarchy	105 seq.
Agnes O'Farrelly, M.A. .	134 n.	Limits when Henry VIII.	
O'Kelly, Colonel Charles,		became king .	110 seq.
author of the work <i>Ma-</i>		Paul III. took it ill that	
<i>cariae Excidium</i> , or <i>The</i>		Henry VIII. had as-	
<i>Destruction of Cyprus</i>	150 seq.	sumed the title of "King	
Old Irish :—		of Ireland," as if in con-	
Should be consulted be-		tempt of the Holy See .	114
fore an Invasion .	7 seq.	Paul IV. :—	
The murder of them not		Erects Ireland into a	
considered a crime by		kingdom at the peti-	
the English .	91	tion of Philip and	
Constantly regarded Ad-		Mary .	113 seq.
rian's Bull as spurious	100	Protects the rights of	
Reduced the limits of		any third party	118
the Pale .	105		

	PAGE		PAGE
Payne, Robert, encourages Englishmen of low condition to come and settle in Ireland . . .	123 n.	Roger de Hoveden :—	
Pepin, King, gave political sovereignty to Popes . . .	56 seq.	Speaks of Henry's flight to Ireland . . .	24
Petau, President, his MSS. purchased by Queen Christina of Sweden . . .	146	Of a Council in Ireland . . .	28 seq.
Peter de Blois, secretary to Henry II. . .	31 seq.	Is contradicted by Raoul de Diceto . . .	28
Peter's Pence :—		Speaks of a Council at Windsor . . .	36
To be established in Ireland . . .	34	Is quoted by Cardinal Baronius . . .	140
Value of the Penny in present money . . .	60	Roger de Wendover, his preamble to the Bull of Adrian . . .	75
Never established in Ireland, even in the Pale . . .	61	Roland, Cardinal, afterwards Pope Alexander III. . .	63 n.
Claimed of England by Pope Innocent III. . .	77	Roman Chancery :—	
Philip and Mary, address a petition to Paul IV. . .	113 seq.	Often used only initials for proper names . . .	10
Pisans rely on a false Bull . . .	34, 58	Its grants on petition are pre-eminently conditional . . .	117
Plunkett, Sir Horace, in a position to do much good for Ireland . . .	85 n.	Romans did not treat conquered nations as the English did . . .	92
Pole, Cardinal, a cousin of Queen Mary, uses his influence at Rome . . .	113 seq.	Roosevelt, Theodore, President of the United States, in sympathy with Ireland . . .	126 n.
<i>Polycraticus</i> . (See John of Salisbury.)		Rotrodus :—	
Pontifical court of the 14th century . . .	92 seq.	His mission to Rome . . .	3 seq.
Poyning sent as lieutenant to Ireland . . .	108	Its object not unknown . . .	19
Protestantism :—		Rymer, Thomas, publishes a large collection of old documents . . .	79 n.
Its beginnings . . .	107 seq.		
The true enemy of Ireland . . .	131	SALAMANCA, UNIVERSITY	
RAOUL DE DICETO speaks of Henry II.'s flight to Ireland . . .	26	of, two cases of conscience submitted for its decision . . .	129 seq.
Rebellion of Irish in 1798 . . .	132	Salisbury. (See John of Salisbury.)	
Richard Coeur de Lion never called himself "Lord of Ireland" . . .	82	Scotland, designs of Henry II. . .	60
Richard II. spends six months in Ireland . . .	107	Signatures. Manner in which Pope and Cardinals signed documents . . .	63 n.
Rinuccini, Archbishop, Papal Envoy, his character yet to be fully vindicated . . .	147 n.	Spanish Doctors. (See Salamanca.)	
		Stephen of Hungary, Saint. A kind of Apostleship confided to him . . .	61

	PAGE		PAGE
Strongbow, Richard :—		His opinion of Henry II.	52
Arrives in Ireland with		Voltaire, his opinion of	
his adventurers	20 seq	Pope Alexander III.	35 n.
His appointment as sene-			
schal of all Ireland,		WALES, its subjugation	
the height of audacity	23	necessary before a con-	
Stubbs, Mr. W., edits a		quest of Ireland . . .	20
new edition of Raoul (or		Walsh, Most Rev. Dr.,	
Ralph) de Diceto . . .	75	Archbishop of Dublin,	
<i>Suggestio</i> , old meaning of		remarks on University	
		Education, the great	
THEINER, MONSIGNOR, Arc-		want of Catholic Ireland	87 n.
hivist of the Vatican.	142	Warner, Mr. G. F., Remarks	
Theobald, Archbishop of		on Giraldus . . .	74 n.
Canterbury . . .	41, 47	Waterford :—	
Thomas of Canterbury, St. :—		A Council said to have	
Present at the siege of		been held here . . .	36
Toulouse . . .	16	No mention of any such	
Martyred on December		Council in Irish chron-	
29, 1170 . . .	23, 27	icles . . .	37
Translation of Document :—		The place totally un-	
Of Pope Adrian's true		suitable for such an	
letter . . .	6 seq.	assembly . . .	37
Of Chapter xlii. of the		Wellington, Duke of, pro-	
<i>Metalogicus</i> . . .	45 seq.	poses Emancipation . . .	134
Of Pope Innocent III.'s		Welsh, their hostilities	
letter on Peter's Pence	77	worthy of pirates and	
Of Pope John XXII.'s		brigands . . .	20 seq.
letter to King Edward		Welsh language in a flour-	
II. . .	96 seq.	ishing condition . . .	135 n.
Of King Edward VI.'s		Wexford, Henry II., after	
<i>Brief</i> . . .	111	waiting five months in	
Of Decree erecting Ire-		Ireland, at last receives	
land into a kingdom	114 seq.	a favourable message	
Of strange story told by		here, and at once sets	
Bzovius . . .	144	out for England and	
Trinity College, Dublin,		Normandy . . .	30 seq.
Monstrous misappli-		William the Conqueror, de-	
cation of its revenues		signs on Ireland . . .	1
	35 n. seq.	William III. Treaty of	
URBAN II., the diploma		Limerick soon broken . . .	128 n.
attributed to him re-		William of Newbridge :—	
garding Corsica is apo-		Remarks on Embassy to	
cryphal . . .	34, 57	Adrian IV. . .	17
VICTOR EMMANUEL pre-		On Richard Strongbow	21 seq.
ceded in his Invasion by		On Hugh de Lacy . . .	40
the Garibaldian Volun-		A source from which	
teers, as Henry II. was		chroniclers draw . . .	74, 140
by the Welsh . . .	21	Winchester :—	
Vivian, Cardinal :—		Adrian's Bull said to be	
Visits Ireland in 1177	38 seq.	faithfully kept there . . .	18 seq.
		But no trace of it to be	
		found . . .	40 seq.

PAGE
[52]
of
35

n
1-
. 2-
3-
4-
y
t
1 87 r.
74 h.

e . 3
h . 3
- .
1 . 3
- .
12

S
1
20 867
135 L
r
1
;
?
;
|
30 867
.
.
128

Trial	Control	MCI	AD
1	95	85	75
2	95	85	75
3	95	80	70
4	95	78	68
5	95	75	65

This book should be returned to
the Library on or before the last date
stamped below.

A fine of five cents a day is incurred
by retaining it beyond the specified
time.

Please return promptly.

